

IBĀDĪ CONSTITUTIONAL THOUGHT

BY

Muhammad Tahir Muhammad Ibrahim

**THESIS PRESENTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ISLAMIC AND MIDDLE EASTERN
STUDIES FACULTY OF ARTS, UNIVERSITY OF
EDINBURGH, 2000**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	iv
Abstract	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Key to transliteration	vii
Introduction	1
A. The principal sources	3
B. Use of terms	11
 Chapter 1: Ibādī views of the early history of Islam	14
✧ The Ibādī attitude toward the Caliphate of ‘Uthmān	14
✧ The Ibādī attitude toward the Caliphate of ‘Alī	28
✧ The Ibādī attitude toward Mu‘āwiyah and the Umayyads	40
✧ The Ibādī attitude toward the Khārijites	45
✧ Conclusion	57
 Chapter 2: The Role of Jābir b. Zayd	66
 Chapter 3: An edition of the Arabic text of Ibn Ibād’s letter to ‘Abd al-Malik	75
 Chapter 4: A translation of Ibn Ibād’s letter to ‘Abd al-Malik	100
 Chapter 5: Ibn Ibād and his letter to ‘Abd al-Malik	125
 Chapter 6: The contribution of Abū ‘Ubaydah and al-Rabī’ b. Ḥabīb	143-151
✧ Abū ‘Ubaydah	143
✧ Al-Rabī’ b. Ḥabīb	148
 Chapter 7: The spread of the Ibādī movement in Arabia	152

✳ The first Ibāḍī Imamate in Yemen	152
✳ The spread of the Ibāḍī movement in Oman	160
1. The first Ibāḍī Imamate in Oman	165
2. The second Ibāḍī Imamate in Oman	169
Conclusion	175
Appendices.....	181-238

I: The political implications of association (<i>walāyah</i>) and dissociation	
(<i>barā'ah</i>) for the Ibāḍīs	181
II : The paths of Religion (<i>masālik al-dīn</i>)	190
1. The path of secrecy (<i>kitmān</i>)	190
2. The path of sacrifice (<i>shirā'</i>)	196
3. The path of defence (<i>difā'</i>)	198
4. The path of manifestation (<i>ẓuhūr</i>)	200
III: The Ibāḍī Imamate	203
✳ The importance and necessity of the Imamate.....	203
✳ The conditions for the Imam (<i>shurūṭ al-Imām</i>).....	207
✳ The duties of the Imam	211
✳ The rights of the Imam	213
✳ The role of <i>shūrā</i> and the method of selecting the Imam..	216
✳ The procedure for appointing the Imam	219
✳ The form of pledge of allegiance (<i>bay'ah</i>)	221
✳ The appointment of an inadequate Imam	223
✳ The removal of the Imam.....	224
✳ The resignation of the Imam.....	226
✳ The possibility of two Imams.....	227
✳ The Imam and the taitor (<i>baghī</i>)	229
✳ The Imams and <i>taqiyyah</i>	231
Bibliography	239

DECLARATION

**I, THE UNDERSIGNED, HEREBY DECLARE THAT THIS THESIS IS
WRITTEN BY MYSELF AND ANY REFERENCES MADE
TO THE SOURCES ARE DULY ACKNOWLEDGED**

Muhammad Tahir Muhammad Ibrahim

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an attempt to analyse the Ibāḍī constitution, particularly in Oman, in the light of the Ibāḍī writings. The main emphasis is on the concept of the Imamate. Although some research has already been done on the Ibāḍī movement, there has been little work done on the Imamate. The introduction outlines the scope, nature and the methodology of the thesis and also gives an account of the sources used. There then follows a section, tracing the historical background to the emergence of the Ibāḍī movement and the movement's attitude toward the first four Caliphs. It also analyses the Ibāḍī attitude toward the Khārijites. A further section deals with the early figures whom Ibāḍīs regard as responsible for the development of their movement. The discussion then moves on to the spread of the Ibāḍī movement in Yemen and Oman. The last section will outline and analyse the theoretical political stages which Ibāḍī constitutional writers have described as necessary for the Ibāḍī movement to achieve an Imamate. The Ibāḍī concept of this Imamate is then analysed, including the methods by which an Imam is chosen and the process by which he may be dismissed. There is also a discussion of the concepts of *walāyah barā'ah* and *taqiyyah* in relation to the Ibāḍī Imamate. Finally a conclusion outlines the results of the thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise is to Allāh, Almighty, and peace be upon all the Messengers.

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who helped me in the course of preparing this thesis. They are too many to mention here, but I am indebted, in particular, to my supervisor, Dr I.K.A. Howard, for his invaluable guidance, constant encouragement, and constructive comments which helped me a great deal in questions of emphasis and clarity of detail through all the stages of this work. Without his help this work could never have been completed.

I wish also to express my appreciation to the Department of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies and the Faculty of Arts for their help and support. My thanks are also due to the secretary of the Department, Miss Lesley Scobie, for her help and kindness and to all the staff of the Main Library, who supplied all the required materials.

I would like also to express my thanks to many friends, in particular, Dr. 'Adel S. Jader, Ṭalāl Malosh, 'Abd Allāh al-Hashimī, Muḥammad al-Mashalī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sālimī, Ḥatim al-Shanfarī, 'Alī Ra'afit and Aḥmad 'Alawī for their help and assistance. I am thankful to all of them.

My deep thanks and appreciation go to my mother, father, my wife and children for their constant encouragement and support, and patience with an absent son, husband and father for such a long time.

KEY TO TRANSLITERATION

The following table of the transliteration system used in this thesis

A. Consonants:

أ	a	ض	<i>ḍ</i>
ب	b	ط	<i>ṭ</i>
ت	t	ظ	<i>ẓ</i>
ث	th	ع	‘
ج	<i>J</i>	غ	<i>gh</i>
ح	<i>ḥ</i>	ف	<i>f</i>
خ	<i>kh</i>	ق	<i>q</i>
د	<i>d</i>	ك	<i>k</i>
ذ	<i>dh</i>	ل	<i>l</i>
ر	<i>r</i>	م	<i>m</i>
ز	<i>z</i>	ن	<i>n</i>
س	<i>s</i>	هـ	<i>h</i>
ش	<i>sh</i>	و	<i>w</i>
ص	<i>ṣ</i>	ي	<i>y</i>
ة	<i>h</i> except when <i>muḍāf</i> ; <i>t</i>		

B. Vowels and Diphthongs

Short vowels:		Long vowels:		Diphthongs:	
ـَ (fatḥah)	<i>a</i>	ـَ / ـِ	<i>ā</i> (كتاب: <i>kitāb</i>)	ـَـو	<i>aw</i> (أولى: <i>awlā</i>)
ـُ (ḍammah)	<i>u</i>	ـُ	<i>ū</i> (كتبو: <i>katabū</i>)	ـِـي	<i>ay</i> (غيب: <i>ghayb</i>)
ـِ (kasra)	<i>i</i>	ـِ	<i>ī</i> (مفتي: <i>muftī</i>)		

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to examine the nature and development of Ibāḍī constitutional thought in the light of Ibāḍī sources. Very little work has been done on the Ibāḍī movement, one of the reasons for this being the lack of availability of Ibāḍī sources. However, in recent years, more material has become available, particularly in Oman. It is this material that will be examined in the course of the thesis.

It will be necessary to elaborate the Ibāḍī views of Islamic history, particularly the early period, which is so crucial to many schools of thought in Islam. In this examination, no attempt will be made to reach any conclusion about the historical correctness of the views reported in the sources. The Sunnī views of this, as presented by the great Islamic historian Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, have been analysed by Wellhausen in *The Religio-Political Factions in Islam* translated by Ostle and Walzer.¹ More recently, there has been the work of Wilferd Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, which presents a view of that early period from a seemingly Shī‘ī perspective.² This thesis will not evaluate these differing views. Rather it will seek to present and explain the view given of those early events by Ibāḍī sources.

There has been some research done on the Ibāḍī movement. In recent years Ennamī has

presented a doctoral thesis on the Ibādī movement but his major concern is the movement in North Africa³. Wilkinson has also written briefly on the early Ibādī Imamate.⁴ One of the reasons for the lack of availability of source material has been the secret nature of the Ibādī movement. Throughout its existence it has maintained a more or less complete religious secrecy under precautionary dissimulation (*taqiyyah*) which will be discussed later. Thus, the writings of its scholars were preserved from outside scrutiny. However, some works were available to scholars and Ennamī has made more of them available, particularly with regard to North Africa. Only recently when the movement in Oman began to feel secure have these writings become more available. However, there is still a considerable amount of material that it is hoped will become available to scholars. In the meantime this thesis has concentrated on such material as is available, particularly sources from Oman.

Although the movement has become known as the Ibādī movement and has been associated with ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibād, this name seems to have been applied by outsiders and was only later adopted by the movement itself. This will be further discussed when the contribution of ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibād is examined.

The approach of the thesis will be first to examine the Ibādī views of their origins as a result of events which occurred during the Caliphate of ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah. There will be a brief survey of some of the leading figures in the Ibādī movement and

their role in the movement in this connection. An Arabic of the famous letter of Ibn Ibāḍ is given as no previous Arabic edition is adequate, followed by a translation and discussion of its content.. There is then a description of how Ibāḍīs consider the movement to have spread to Yemen and Oman. As Oman is one of the major concerns of this thesis, little attention will be paid to the movement in North Africa. Ennamī gave this considerable attention in his thesis. The thesis will then elaborate Ibāḍī views of the political and theological concepts of association (*walāyah*) and dissociation (*barā'ah*). Finally, the nature, and status and type of the Ibāḍī Imamate will be discussed.

It has been difficult to collate all the historical information about the movement from Ibāḍī sources. This is due to the fact that this information is mainly spread throughout Ibāḍī legal (*fiqh*) works. Furthermore, in these works there is no focus on the political aspects of the movement and information on such matters is also spread through different works of *fiqh*.

The principal sources

Rasā'il of Jābir b. Zayd (d. 93. A.H.) is a collection of eighteen letters written by Jābir b. Zayd al-Azdī to various people. The collection has been gathered by the Ministry of National Heritage and Culture, Oman, from various manuscripts in their library. They have at present compiled this collection in typewritten form, a copy of which they kindly made available to me. These letters are considered to be written by Jābir b. Zayd but

there is no clear evidence to prove or disprove their authenticity.⁵ Ennamī was aware of these letters and mentioned them in his thesis.

The *Musnad* of al-Rabī' b. Ḥabīb al-Farāhīdī, (b. 75-80A.H. and d. 175-180 A.H)⁶ is considered to be the main book of *ḥadīth* by Ibādīs. Al-Warjālānī (d.570) arranged it in accordance with different matters of *fiqh*. It also includes *ḥadīth* regarding the Imamate.

Al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt li-'Ulāmā' wa-A'immat'Umān. This is the most important source available. It is an early compilation of letters written by Ibādī scholars from the first century to the sixth century A.H. The volumes of *al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt* were edited by Sayyidah Ismā'īl Kāshif.⁷ The word *siyar* (singular *sīrah*) in the title relates to early usage and means practices or *sunan*. Thus, the work is mainly to do with the explanation of a variety of problems, often answered in the form of a letter. Among the documents, there is included the letter of Ibn Ibād (d.circa.86) to the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik b.Marwān. There has been much discussion among scholars about the authenticity of two letters allegedly written by Ibn Ibād to 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān. Cook has argued that the first is a forgery, and the fact that it does not appear in this compilation would appear to support this view.⁸ His views on the second letter second and the existence of 'Abd Allāh b. Ibād will be discussed later. An edited Arabic version

together with an English translation of the letter is given in the text of this thesis as the edition in *al-Siyar* has taken no note of the texts of the letter from North Africa and also contains many mistakes. The compilation also includes the *Sīrah* of Shabīb b. ‘Aṭīyyah al-‘Umānī (d. 2nd century A.H.). This *Sīrah* defends the position of the people of al-Nahrawān in rebelling against tyrants (*bughāt*) and those who innovate (*aḥdath*) in the religion of Allāh. The compilation also contains other useful early documents including the *Sīrah* or letter of Maḥbūb b. Ruḥayl (d. 2nd century A.H.) and the letter of Abū al-Mu’thir al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs (d. 3rd century A.H.) who wrote a *Sīrah* on disruptive political innovations (*aḥdāth*) and another on fighting rebels (*fi qitāl ahl al-baghy*). Among the *siyar* in the compilation is a *Sīrah* of Abū al-Ḥawārī Muḥammad b. al-Ḥawārī (d. 3rd century A.H.). The letter seems to have been written after Abū al-Mu’thir because an independent work by him, *al-Jāmi’*, seems to have used some of the material presented by Abū al-Mu’thir in his two previously mentioned letters in addition to *fiqh* matters. These *siyar* contain vital information about the legislation of the Imamate, its conditions and system, as well as the duties of the Imams and important aspects of the history of Oman. In total the compilation contains thirty-four *siyar* or letters from between the first and sixth centuries A.H.

Another source is *Al-Islam min Wajhat Naẓar al-Ibāḍīyyah* by Ibn Sallām al-Ibāḍī (d. toward the end of 3rd century A.H.)⁹ This book is one of the oldest books on the history of the Ibāḍīs. The author examines the questions of faith, the names of Ibāḍī scholars in

the east, the revolution of those who seek the truth (*ṭālib al-ḥaqq*) and the lives of some of the Companions of the Prophet. He also details the unjust actions committed by the Umayyads and the Abbasids. In addition, the author gives some information about the Imamate.

Another source is *Akḥbār al-ʿImmah al-Rustumiyyīn* by Ibn al-Ṣaghīr al-Mālikī (d. 3rd century A.H.)¹⁰ This book is one of the main sources for the Rustumī Imams who lived in Tahart and the origin of the Ibādīs in North Africa in 162 A.H. It also mentions the relations between the Ibādī movement in Baṣrah and its followers in North Africa.

There is also *Al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān* by Abū ʿAbd Allāh, Muḥammad Saʿīd al-Azdī al-Qalhātī (d. during 4th century A.H.).¹¹ Although the author offers a fairly comprehensive analysis of the Khārijite groups, he concentrates his account on the Ibādīs as he considered this faction as the one which remained on the right path. He also, includes historical information about the rightly-guided Caliphs.

In *al-Istiḡamah* by Abū Saʿīd, Muḥammad b. Saʿīd al-Kudamī (d. 4th century).¹² In this work, the author introduced the opinions of the Ibādīs with regard to the events which happened in Oman at the end of the second century A.H. and on issues of the Imamate. The author also wrote *al-Muʿtabar*,¹³ in which he gives information about questions of *fiḡh*, *walāyah*, and *barāʾah* and *taqiyyah*.

Al Siyar wa-Akhabār al-A'imma by Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā b. Abū Bakr al-Warjālānī (d. in the fifth century A.H.)¹⁴ is considered to be one of the main sources of the Ibādī movement in North Africa. It examines the Ibādī Rustumī Imamate in North Africa which collapsed in 279 A.H. It also provides a brief overview of the Ibādī movement in Baṣrah and its relationship with members in North Africa.

Kitāb al-Ansāb by Salamah b. Maslamah al-‘Awtabī (died in the fifth century A.H.)¹⁵ The author mentions the lineage of the tribe of Azd in Oman and comments on their spread in Oman. The author also mentions some historical events, in particular those surrounding the career of al-Muhallab.

Bayan al-Shar‘ by Muhammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Kindī (d. 508 A.H.)¹⁶ is considered to be an essential source for the study of the Ibādī movement. The book consists of fifty-two volumes of *fiqh*, and also deals with the questions of *walāyah* and *barā’ah*. The author gives an account of leading Ibādī figures in the fifth volume and the policy of ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyad towards the Ibādī movement. In the sixth volume he discusses *taqiyyah*, which he allows both verbally and in terms of action.

An additional source is *Kitāb al-Muṣannaḥ* by Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Kindī

(d. 557 A.H.). Volume Eight of this work is of most relevance.¹⁷ The focus in this book is on the law and the legislation of the Imamate. It is considered to be one of the most comprehensive books written by Ibāḍīs about the Imamate. It deals with the system of the Imamate, the conditions of the Imam, the choice of the Imam, the reasons for removing the Imam and reasons for revolting against the Imam. Thus, the *Muṣannaf* is considered to present the constitutional system of the Ibāḍīs. It is published by the Ministry of National Heritage and Culture in Oman. Al-Kindī also wrote *Kitāb al-Ihtidā'*.¹⁸ This book is a collection of *siyar* of the scholars and Imams of Oman. Primarily, the reason for writing this book was a disagreement among the Ibāḍī groups, al-Nazwāniyyah and al-Rastāqiyyah, concerning the issue of the Imamate. This book focusses on the reasons required to revolt against the Imam and the consequences of such action in causing discord (*fitnah*). The Imamate and the rights and duties of the Imam are also examined. A further work by the same author is *al-Jawhar al-Muqtaṣar*.¹⁹ The author relies on Ibāḍī scholars from the third and fourth centuries. He then gives an explanation of the meaning of Ibāḍiyyah. Other topics addressed in the course of the book include the grades of the people of polytheism (*shirk*) and the people of truth (*ḥaqq*). Further explanations are given of the beliefs (*'aqīdah*) held by the people of al-Nahrawān.

Qanāṭir al-Khayrāt by Abū Ṭāhir Isma‘īl b. Mūsā al-Jīṭālī (d. 750 A.H.).²⁰ This book discusses *fiqh* questions. In the fourth section of the book, the author focusses on the Imam and his conditions and his duties. He also wrote *Qawā'id al-Islām*²¹ which discuss matters of *fiqh*, *walāyah* and *barā'ah*.

Al-Jawāhir al-Muntaqāh by Abū al-Faḍal al-Barrādī (d. 792 A.H.)²² This book contains some information about the history of the Ibāḍīs and a copy of ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ’s letter.

In *Al-Siyar* by Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd al-Shammākhī (d. 928 A.H.)²³ the author mentions important historical information about the rightly guided Caliphs. He also refers to the events around the *fitnah*, the judgement of arbitration and gives information about the Ibāḍī leaders including Abū Bilāl, Abū ‘Ubaydah and Jābir b. Zayd.

Kashf al-Ghummah is work of disputed authorship. However, in the section on the Imamate which was published in Oman the editor attributes it to Sirḥān b. Sa‘īd al-Azkawī (d. 1140 A.H.)²⁴ Since Ennamī’s thesis, scholars have also paid attention to the “two letters” of Ibn Ibāḍ. These “two letters” are reported from *Kashf al-Ghummah* by al-Azkawī, who must have died after 1140 A.H, when the latest event recorded in *Kashf al-Ghummah* is dated. However, recently *al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, which contains thirty-

four letters of the Ibādī scholars in Oman, from the first century to the sixth, has been published. This does not contain Ibn Ibād's second letter.

Qāmūs al-Sharī'ah by Jamāl b. Khamīs. (d. in 11th century A.H)²⁵ includes different sections of *fiqh*, and discusses *taqiyyah*, *walāyah*, *barā'ah*, and matters related to the Imamate.

Al-Nūr al-Waqād fī 'Ilm al-Rashād by Muḥammad b. Salīm b. Zāhir (d. 1287.A.H)²⁶

This book discusses the concept of Imamate and its conditions and include a discussion of the nature of *bughāt*.

Tuḥfat al-A'yān fī Sīrat Ahl 'Umān by Nūr al-Dīn al-Sālimī (d. 1332 A.H.)²⁷ is

considered to be one of the main sources of the history of the Imams in Oman, the development of the Imamate and the names of scholars, in addition to the spread of the Ibādī movement in Oman. Al-Sālimī relies on early Ibādī sources, for instance *siyar* of Abū al-Mu'thir, Maḥbūb b. al-Ruḥayl and others. He also wrote a commentary on the *Musnad* of al-Rabī' b. Ḥabīb.²⁸ In this he gives valuable information, in the part concerning the Imamate, in regarding the meaning of *khurūj* and the condition of Imams being from Quraysh.

Ennamī uses manuscript of a letter by Sālim b. Dhakwān, who lived during the first

century A.H. Cook has also uses the manuscript in *Early Muslim Dogma*, but I was unable to obtain a copy of this manuscript. Judging by the quotations by Ennamī and Cook, it adds little to our knowledge of the Ibādī views on history and the Imamate. I have just learnt that an edition of the letter has been recently published. It was not immediately available and is still not available in any bookshops or libraries. I was, therefore, unable to consult it due to the requirements for the submission of this thesis.

In addition to Ibādī material, the main historical sources used are those of al-Ṭabarī,²⁹ Khalīfah b. Khayyāṭ³⁰ and al-Mubarrad.³¹

Use of terms

In general an attempt has been made to translate Arabic terms and to give their Arabic form in brackets afterwards where this was felt necessary. However, some terms are used in their transliterated form after the English translation has been given. Certain well-known terms have been given in their Arabic form only. Such terms are *ummah* and *ḥadīth*. Where necessary the English plural has been used for such words. Imam and Imamate have been used as English words with no attempt at transliteration. Well-known place names have been given in their English forms, e.g. Mecca, Medina and Oman. Other place names are given either fully transliterated or in a compromise form, for example Kūfah and Baṣrah.

- ¹ J. Wellhausen, *The Religio-Political Faction in Early Islam*, (trans. by R.C. Ostle and S.M. Walzer), Amsterdam, 1975.
- ² W. Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, Cambridge, 1997.
- ³ Ennamī, *Studies in Ibāḍism*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1971.
- ⁴ J.C. Wilkinson, *The Imamate of Oman*, Cambridge, 1987.
- ⁵ *Rasā'il Jābir b. Zayd*, type-written compilation from manuscripts in the Library of the Ministry of National Heritage and Culture, Oman, n.d.
- ⁶ Al-Rabī' b. Ḥabīb. *Musnad*, Oman, n.d.
- ⁷ *Al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābat li-'Ulāma' wa-A'immat 'Umān*, ed. by Sayyidah Ismā'il Kāshif, Oman, vol I, 1989 & II, 1986.
- ⁸ M. Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, Cambridge, 1980.
- ⁹ Ibn Sallām al-Ibāḍī, *al-Islam min Wajhat Naẓār al-Ibāḍiyyah*, ed. by Sālim b. Ya'qūb, Wiesbaden, 1986.
- ¹⁰ Ibn al-Saghir al-Malikī, *Akhhbār al-A'imma al-Rutumiyyīn* ed. by Muḥammad Naṣir and Ibrahim Biḥāz, Lebanon, 1986.
- ¹¹ Abū 'Abd Allāh, Muḥammad Sa'īd al-Azdī al-Qalhātī *Al-Kashf wal- Bayān*, 2 vols, Oman, 1980.
- ¹² Abū Sa'īd , Muḥammad b. Sa'īd al-Kudamī, *al-Istiḳāmah*, 3 vols, Oman, 1985.
- ¹³ Abū Sa'īd , Muḥammad b. Sa'īd al-Kudamī, *al-Mu'tabar*, 4 vols, Oman, 1985.
- ¹⁴ Abī Zakariyyā Yaḥya b. Abū Bakr al-Warjālānī, *al-Siyar wa-Akhhbār al-A'imma*, Oman,
- ¹⁵ Salamah b Maslamah al-'Awtabī, *Kitāb al-Ansāb*, vols., I & II, Oman, 1990.
- ¹⁶ Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, al-Kindī, *Bayan al-Shar'*, 52 vols., Oman, 1988.
- ¹⁷ Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kindī, *Kitāb al-Muṣannaf*, vol VIII, Oman, 1985.
- ¹⁸ Abū Bakr Aḥmed bin 'Abd Allāh al-Kindī al-Nazwānī, *Kitāb al- Ihtidā'*, edited by S.I. Kashif, Oman, 1985.
- ¹⁹ Abū Bakr Aḥmad bin 'Abd Allāh al-Kindī, *al-Jawhar al-Muqtaṣar*, Oman, 1985.
- ²⁰ Abū Ṭahir Isma'īl b. Mūsā al-Jiṭālī, *Qanāṭir al-Khayrat*, 3 vols., Oman, 1989.
- ²¹ Abū Ṭahir Isma'īl b. Mūsā al-Jiṭālī, *Qawā'id al-Islām*, 2 vols., Oman, 1992.
- ²² Abū al-Faḍal al-Barāḍī, *al-Jawāhir al-Muntaqāh*, Bārūnī, Press, 1885.
- ²³ Aḥmad b. Sa'īd al-Shammākhī, *al-Ṣiyar*, vol I, ed. by Aḥmad b. Sa'ūd al-Siyābī, Oman, 1992.
- ²⁴ Sirḥān Sa'īd al-Azkawī, *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ*, edited by 'Abd al-Majīd Ḥasīb al-Qaysī, Oman, n.d.
- ²⁵ Jamīl b. Khamīs, *Qāmūs al- Sharī'ah*, 19 vols., Oman, 1983.
- ²⁶ Muḥammad b. Salim b. Zāhir al-Rqayshī, *al-Nūr al-Waqād fi 'ilm al-Rashād*, Oman, 1984
- ²⁷ Nūr al-Dīn al-Sālimī, *Tuḥfat al-A'yān fi Sīrat Ahl 'Umān*, vols. I & II, Oman, n.d.

²⁸ Nūr al-Dīn al-Sālimī, *Sharḥ al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, 3 vols, Oman, n.d.

²⁹ Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa-al-Mulūk*, ed. de Goeje et al, Leiden, 1879-1901.

³⁰ Khalīfah b. Khayāṭ, *Tārīkh Khalīfah*, edited by Akram Ḍiyā' al-'Umarī, Beirut, 1977.

³¹ Al-Mubarrad, Muḥammad b. Yazīd, *al-Kāmil fī al-Adab*, Cairo, nd.

CHAPTER ONE

IBĀDĪ VIEWS OF THE EARLY HISTROY OF ISLAM

The Ibāḍī attitude toward the Caliphate of ‘Uthmān

Ibāḍī sources all consider that their movement is a continuation of Islam as taught by the Prophet and practised by the first two caliphs, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar.¹ They consider that this true Islam was undermined by ‘Uthmān and they are continuing the true path of Islam. Thus they always refer to those whom they consider as their predecessors as “the Muslims.”²

Ibāḍī sources emphasise the role that they allege ‘Uthmān played in bringing about discord (*fitnah*)³ in the *ummah* of the Muslims and therefore also need the need for those who would protest against such actions and attempt to restore the *ummah* to the state which it had been under the Prophet and the first two caliphs, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. They claim that the Qur’ānic verse: “And fear discord (*fitnah*) which affects not in particular only those of you who do wrong and know that Allāh is severe in punishment” (8:25)⁴ was addressed to the Companions of the Prophet because Allāh knew that discord would break out. Another verse warning against the practices which ‘Uthmān would adopt was: “Would you then, if you were given the authority, do mischief in the land, and sever your ties of kinship, such are they whom Allāh has cursed, so that he made them deaf and blind” (47:22-3).⁵

However, these sources concede that ‘Uthmān’s conduct during the first six years of his caliphate was correct, even though it did not reach the standard of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar.⁶ During that period, they maintain that “the Muslims” accepted his authority and followed him because they recognised that obedience to him was a duty and an obligation.⁷ There is a tendency in the sources to suggest that ‘Uthmān’s behaviour deteriorated as a result of the increased wealth which came to the community. Despite this, some of the actions for which they denounced ‘Uthmān took place within the first six years of his caliphate.⁸

One of the major accusations made against ‘Uthmān concerns his failure to spread the newly acquired wealth more equitably among the community. It is claimed that he kept the wealth among the rich,⁹ thereby denying the Qur’ānic injunction: “In order that it may not become a fortune used by the rich among you.” (5:97)¹⁰ It is also claimed that he wrongly used money from the state treasury to build houses for himself. Many of his other alleged faults include abuses in the distribution of wealth, particularly with regard to his own relatives.¹¹

As far as ‘Uthmān’s relatives are concerned, it is claimed that he appointed foolish (*sufaha*)¹² relatives to positions of authority. One example of this was that he appointed al-Walīd b. ‘Uqbah b. Abī Mu‘ayṭ, who was his half-brother, to be his governor in Kūfah.¹³ Ibāḍī sources describe him as “the most corrupt of his time.”¹⁴ The main historical sources also describe this man and his behaviour as governor in such a light that eventually ‘Uthmān was forced to dismiss him. Another relative whom Ibāḍī

sources allege that ‘Uthmān favoured al-Ḥakam b. Umayyah. This man had been exiled by the Prophet. ‘Uthmān allowed him to return and, according to Ibādī sources, gave him one hundred thousand *dirhams*¹⁵ from the treasury of the Muslims. These sources also allege that he favoured al-Ḥakam’s son, Marwān, in a similar manner, giving him the *khums* from Africa. Another relative to whom ‘Uthmān gave preference was his foster-brother, ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Ṣarḥ. This man had previously withdrawn from Islam and had been denounced by the Prophet as an enemy of Allāh.¹⁶ ‘Uthmān appointed him as governor of Egypt.

Other financial irregularities which Ibādī sources accuse ‘Uthmān of having perpetrated include interference with the stipends which were paid to the Companions of the Prophet as fixed by ‘Umar in the *dīwān*.¹⁷ Thus, he is accused of reducing the stipends paid to those who had fought at the Battle of Badr.¹⁸ He is also accused of taking the *ṣadaqah* or *zakāt* for himself and his family in defiance of the Qur’ānic stipulation: “Alms are for the poor and the needy, and those employed to administer the funds, for those whose hearts have been reconciled [to the truth], for those in bondage and in debt, in the cause of Allāh and for the wayfarer. Thus is it ordained by Allāh, and Allāh is full of knowledge and wisdom.”(9:60)¹⁹ In addition, ‘Uthmān is accused of interfering with the operation of the market by not allowing the people to sell their produce until the government had sold its own produce. It was claimed that this action was in breach of the Qur’ānic verse: “But Allāh has permitted trade and forbidden usury” (2: 275).²⁰ As a result of these actions, much wealth was illegally accumulated by ‘Uthmān. This wealth, the sources claim, was hoarded in gold and silver by ‘Uthmān. In doing so, he

was violating yet another Qur'ānic stipulation: "And there are those who bury gold and silver, and spend it not in the way of Allāh. Announce unto them a most grievous penalty. On the day when heat will be produced out of that [wealth] in the fire of Hell, and with it will be branded their foreheads, their flanks and their backs. This is a treasure, which you buried for yourselves; taste you, then, the treasure you buried" (9: 34-5).²¹

In matters of administering the laws revealed by Allāh, 'Uthmān is particularly accused of failing to apply the revealed punishment (*ḥadd*) for murder. This is the punishment termed *qiṣāṣ* which requires that a murderer be subject to the will of the victim's relatives either to be killed for his crime or to be forgiven or to pay blood-wit. Two cases of this are mentioned. The first occurred immediately after his accession to the caliphate. 'Ubayd Allāh b 'Umar killed al-Hurmuzān,²² whom he wrongly believed to be involved in the murder of his father. 'Uthmān did not punish him and thus, according to many, including Ibāḍīs, was guilty of a failure to apply the revealed punishment.²³ The other incident cited by the Ibāḍīs involves the situation towards the end of 'Uthmān's caliphate when those aggrieved with him, who are termed Muslims by the Ibāḍīs, surrounded his palace. One of 'Uthmān's followers killed one of the dissidents, Dīnār b. 'Iyyāḍ. 'Uthmān refused to have the man killed despite the demands of Dīnār's relatives.²⁴

Ibāḍī sources also accuse 'Uthmān of introducing religious innovations. The Prophet had given his sermons from the top step of the minbar. Abū Bakr and 'Umar, in

deference to the Prophet, had always delivered their sermons from the second step. ‘Uthmān reverted to the place from which the Prophet had given his sermons, thereby causing offence to the Muslims as described by the Ibādīs.²⁵

In this long array of charges against ‘Uthmān, Ibādī sources also include accusations about his treatment of those Companions of the Prophet who complained about his behaviour. They cite the case of Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī,²⁶ who, when he denounced ‘Uthmān’s behaviour, was exiled to al-Rabadhah,²⁷ where he died. They point to ‘Uthmān having hit ‘Ammār b. Yāsir²⁸ in the stomach and injuring him when he also denounced ‘Uthmān. They also mention his dismissal of ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd²⁹ when he refused to accept ‘Uthmān’s innovation.³⁰

The Ibādī sources regard the following Qur’anic verses as referring to ‘Uthmān: “And remember when We took your covenant, shed no blood amongst you, nor turned your own people from their homes. And this you solemnly ratified. Then, to this you bear witness. After this it is you the same people who slay among yourselves, and drive out a party of you from their homes; assist (their enemies) against them in sin and transgression, and if they come to you, as captives, you ransom them, though it was not lawful for you to expel them. Then is it only a part of the Book that you believe in and reject the rest? But what is the reward for those among you who behave like this, but disgrace in this life? And on the Day of Judgement, they shall be consigned the most grievous penalty. For Allāh is not unmindful of what you do. These are the people who

buy the life of this world at the price of the hereafter. Their penalty shall not be lightened, nor shall they be helped” (2: 84-6).³¹

The Ibādī sources argue that the actions of ‘Uthmān make him an unbeliever and in support of this claim they cite the Qur’ānic verses: “If any do fail to judge by what Allāh has revealed, they are unbelievers... wrongdoers... and they are rebellious to Allāh ” (5: 44, 45, 47)³² In addition they refer to the Qur’ānic verse: “And if anyone contends with the Messenger after guidance has been plainly conveyed to him, and follows a path other than that becoming of the believers, We shall leave him in the path he has chosen. And We will roast him in Hell. What an evil refuge” (4:115).³³ They emphasise the seriousness of ‘Uthmān’s situation with another Qur’ānic verse: “Behold! the curse of God is on those who do wrong”(11:18).³⁴

Having established to their satisfaction that ‘Uthmān’s actions were tantamount to unbelief, the Ibādī sources then seek to demonstrate the Qur’ānic implications of this. They cite the verses in the Qur’ān which enjoin the Muslims not to allow unbelievers to have authority over them. These verses involve use of the term *walī* with its plural *awliyā’* which can mean a person with authority.³⁵ Thus, they cite: “Let not the believers take for *awliyā’* or helpers unbelievers rather than believers; if they do that in nothing will there be help from Allāh; except by way of precaution, that you may guard yourselves from them. But Allāh cautions you against Himself, for the final goal is to Allāh.” (3:28) In addition to this, they quote the verse: “O you who believe! Take not for *awli’yā’* unbelievers rather than believers; do you wish to offer Allāh an open proof

against yourselves?”(4:144) They reinforce this view with the verse: “And incline not toward those who do wrong, lest the Fire should touch you, and you have no protectors (*awli'yā*) other than Allāh, nor you would be then helped.” (11:113) The implication is that ‘Uthmān has put himself outside Islam and Allāh has demanded that they should not accept his authority.

The Ibādī sources are anxious to claim that their group, whom they call “the Muslims” were not the only ones who were concerned about ‘Uthmān’s conduct. They assert that the wives of the Prophet had spoken against him. ‘Ā’ishah held the Qur’ān in her hand and swore by Allāh that ‘Uthmān disbelieved in what is in the Qur’ān.³⁶ The sources also indicate that “the Muslims” did not act precipitately against ‘Uthmān. They claim that when “the Muslims” saw the actions of ‘Uthmān, they were not in a hurry to go against him. They decided to discuss it with him to make sure that he had no excuse. The sources explain that it was their duty to act in this way because the Muslims are witnesses to Allāh for the behaviour of mankind.³⁷ If his actions are right and in accordance with the Qur’ān, they would accept them and co-operate with him. However, if he had gone astray, they would oppose him until he followed the Qur’ān. In support of this, they cited the Qur’ān: “And say: ‘Work righteousness.’ Soon will Allāh observe your work and His Apostle and the believers; soon you will be brought back to the Knower of what is hidden and what is open. Then will He show you the truth of all that you did.” (9:105) Therefore, they went to him at Medina from different parts of the country to discuss his actions with him and if necessary denounce his behaviour and make sure that he reformed.³⁸

The sources report that when “the Muslims” gathered they went to ‘Uthmān and they reminded him of the verses in the Qur’ān. They drew his attention to what they considered to be his misdeeds and the sins that he had committed. He admitted that he accepted what they had said and he repented before Allāh and agreed to follow the right path. “The Muslims” accepted his confession and repentance and departed.³⁹

However, according to the Ibāḍī sources, when they left his palace, he wrote to his governors instructing them to execute them. He told them that if they came at night, they were not to let them stay alive until the morning, and if they came in the morning, they were not to allow them to remain alive until night. However, on the journey home, “the Muslims” intercepted a servant of ‘Uthmān’s and found a letter with his seal on it in the possession of his servant, containing the instructions to his governors to kill them.⁴⁰ Thus, the Ibāḍī sources maintain that ‘Uthmān’s treachery was discovered.⁴¹ Among Sunnīs the matter is regarded in a different way. A number of accounts are concerned with the letter which ‘Uthmān is accused of having written to Ibn Abī al-Sarḥ in which he asks for the death of the rebels who had entered Medina. However ‘Uthmān denied having written this letter completely. The following account indicates what took place:

While they were on the road, a rider appeared and approached them then went away and then reappeared ahead of them. They asked him: ‘What is the matter?’ He replied, ‘I am the messenger of the Commander of the Faithful to his agent (*‘āmil*) in Egypt.’ Then they searched him and found the letter in the words of ‘Uthmān and bearing his seal to his governor ordering him to kill the rebels, or

crucify them, or to cut off their hands and feet. They then continued until they had entered Medina where they approached ‘Alī and said to him: ‘Look at the enemy of Allāh ! He has written this about us so now Allāh has made his blood lawful (*ḥalāl*) for us. Come with us to him.’ ‘Alī said: ‘No by Allāh I will not come with you.’ They said: ‘Then why did you write to us?’ He said: ‘No by Allāh I did not write to you at all.’ Then they looked at one another then said to one another: ‘Do we fight because of this or do we just become angry?’ Then ‘Alī left and exited Medina for a village, and they left and entered upon ‘Uthmān saying, ‘You have written such and such about us.’ He said: ‘You have two options – to get two Muslim men to testify against me, or to have me swear by Allāh,⁴² and there is no deity but He, that I did not write or dictate or have any knowledge of this letter.’ He also said: ‘You may be aware that a letter may be written in the name of a person and that a seal may be forged.’ They said, ‘By Allāh, your blood has been made lawful, and the treaty and the covenant have been broken.’”⁴³

The Sunnī school believe that this letter was written in the name of ‘Uthmān by the rebels themselves in order to justify the killing of ‘Uthmān.⁴⁴ There are some accounts pointing to the fact that they forged the letter sent in the name of ‘Alī, as made clear in the above, and this in addition to what was written by ‘Uthmān’s representative in Egypt which incited the people to rebel against ‘Uthmān. He signed these letters in the name of the mothers of the faithful.⁴⁵

The people who stood to benefit from forging the letter were the rebels alone. It is likely that al-Ashtar and Ḥakīm b. Jabalah were the ones who devised this letter, because the Iraqī caravans were in the East and the Egyptians were in the West, but they both returned to Medina simultaneously. ‘Uthmān denied the writing of the letter and accounts of its contents differ widely; some narrate that flogging and shaving of the head were ordered, while in another the governor is instructed to cut off hands and to

crucify. Additionally, the people mentioned in the accounts differ from one to the other.⁴⁶

The differences regarding the contents of this single, very important letter add to the doubts over its authenticity.⁴⁷ Also, the report indicated that the messenger of ‘Uthmān went in the direction of the rebels. “While they were on the road, a rider appeared and approached them, then left them and then reappeared ahead of them.”⁴⁸ This indicates that the messenger authenticity is questionable; he would certainly have changed direction towards Egypt, or at least have hidden from the rebels to prevent them from discovering their impending fate.

As a result of this, “the Muslims” returned to Medina to confront ‘Uthmān with his treachery. They went to him and declared: “You have committed injustice and outrage and evil before today and you knew that and admitted it, promising to repent and we accepted that from you! We accused you of not following the right path, but today we will make accusations against you about Allah's religion and our blood. So step down so that we can select another one who will maintain justice among us and in whose hands we will feel safe in our religion.” However, ‘Uthmān refused to step down and said that he would not take off the garment [of authority] that had been given to him by Allāh.⁴⁹

The Ibādī sources claim that despite all this provocation, “the Muslims” were reluctant to take violent action against him. Again they appealed to him and called upon him to stop his wicked actions. However, ‘Uthmān insisted on his right to continue these actions. Despite all the evidence that they claim to have had against ‘Uthmān, the

sources insist that “the Muslims” were unwilling to start fighting ‘Uthmān. They claim that it was not until one of ‘Uthmān’s supporters killed one of the Muslims, that they were forced to take action. The victim was Dīnār b ‘Iyyād. When they demanded that ‘Uthmān should kill the killer, he refused, saying: “I will not kill a man who is supporting me while you want to kill me.”⁵⁰ It was because of this that they knew that they would have to fight against him.

“The Muslims” besieged ‘Uthmān’s palace (*dār*). They were resisted by three groups supporting ‘Uthmān, a group led by Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, a group led by al-Mughīrah b. Al-Akhnas al-Thaqafī and another group led by ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr. Both sides engaged in heavy fighting. Support and assistance for ‘Uthmān was expected from Baṣrah but was delayed when still a day’s journey from Medina. However, support did come to him from the people of Syria there was a fierce battle in front of the palace and ‘Uthmān’s supporters were forced to withdraw into the palace. In the course of the battle, ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr was wounded and forced to withdraw from the scene.⁵¹

Having mentioned those who are claimed to have supported ‘Uthmān, the Ibādī sources are anxious to describe the alleged activities of other leading Muslim figures to indicate that they were not supporting ‘Uthmān. They claim that at this time ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib was in the Prophet’s mosque urging the people to fight against ‘Uthmān while Ṭalḥah b. ‘Ubayd Allāh was standing in front of the palace urging the people to enter the palace and fight.⁵² This claim is only mentioned by the Ibādī sources. In the Sunnī account of this the Holy Qur’ān praises those who were first to embrace Islam amongst the

Companions of the Prophet,⁵³ and the Prophet himself mentions that the best of generations was his generation, then those who came after him, then those who came after them.⁵⁴ In addition it is affirmed that the best of the Companions were the four rightly guided caliphs Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, and ‘Alī.⁵⁵

The reason for this station having been given to the prophetic companions was their faith in Allāh and His prophet, their striving in the way of Allāh, their emigration and assistance, their useful knowledge, and their righteous deeds. This however does not mean that the companions were in any way infallible or ‘restrained’ from sins both great and small, but when the errors that they did commit are compared with their virtuous acts they amount to ‘no more than a drop in the ocean’.⁵⁶

The opinion of the Sunnīs towards the stance taken by ‘Alī regarding the killing of ‘Uthmān can be summarised as follows. There was a suspicion that ‘Alī had ordered the killing of ‘Uthmān, but he sincerely swore that he had neither killed him nor collaborated in his death, nor did he approve of his death, and this is known without any doubt. However, certain of ‘Alī’s supporters and a group of his detractors broadcast that he did indeed approve of ‘Uthman’s having been killed. His admirers sought by this to attack ‘Uthmān and to support their view that he deserved to die and that ‘Alī had ordered his death. His detractors sought by this to attack ‘Alī and to imply that he had aided the death of the martyred Caliph, who had shown patience and had not defended himself nor shed the blood of any Muslim in defending himself, or for that matter in securing obedience to himself as Caliph.⁵⁷

There are a number of extent accounts extant which mention the attitude of ‘Alī towards the death of ‘Uthmān, all of which are in accord that ‘Alī had not agreed to nor approved of the death of ‘Uthmān:

“We testify that ‘Alī said, ‘By Allah I did not kill, I did not order, I did not participate in, and I did not approve of the killing of ‘Uthmān.’”⁵⁸

In another account it is related that in 86 A.H. two older men said:

“We heard ‘Alī say: ‘By Allāh, I did not kill ‘Uthmān, nor did I order, participate in, or approve of his death.’”⁵⁹

It appears that the reason for the accusation that ‘Alī had killed ‘Uthmān was that he accepted the caliphate after ‘Uthmān. The following account shows that Ibn ‘Abbas had alluded to the fact that if ‘Alī took the position of caliph he would be accused of the murder of ‘Uthmān:

It is related by ‘Amr b. Dīnār who said:

The people asked Ibn ‘Abbas to lead the pilgrimage while ‘Uthmān was besieged. So Ibn ‘Abbas went to ‘Uthmān and asked him for permission to lead the pilgrimage⁶⁰ which he subsequently did. Then he returned and found that ‘Uthmān had been killed. He said to ‘Alī: ‘Now if you undertake this matter [the caliphate the people will associate you with the blood of ‘Uthmān until the Day of resurrection.’⁶¹

Additionally, it was ‘Alī who undertook the role of mediator between ‘Uthmān and those who rebelled against him, on the recommendation of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar. The following account makes clear what occurred:

Related by ‘Alī b. Muhammad, from Abū Miḥnaf, from Muhammad b. Yusuf, from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Jundab who relates the following:

‘Uthman said to ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, ‘What is your opinion about these people?’ He said, ‘You should call them to the book of Allāh. If they agree then it will be better for them, and if they refuse, it will be better for you and the worst for them. You should send ‘Alī for no-one other than he can repel them from you.’ He said, ‘May Allah reward you well O family of ‘Umar for you have for a long time helped Islam and advised its people.’ So ‘Uthmān sent to ‘Alī and said, ‘Go to these people and give them whatever they ask of you.’ He said, ‘Do you ensure this?’ He said: ‘Yes.’ So ‘Alī went to them and they received him kindly and ‘Alī said, ‘You will be given the book of Allāh and you will be redressed for all that you have been displeased with.’ They said, ‘Do you ensure this?’ He said, ‘Yes.’ Then thirty of the rebels went with him and they entered upon ‘Uthmān who gave them satisfaction and a document was drawn up between them as follows: ‘From ‘Abd Allāh ‘Uthman Commander of the Faithful to those who are hostile to him. You are to act according to the book of Allāh, and those who have been unfairly treated will be recompensed, and the banished will be returned, the envoy will not be ordered to carry out his mission in severe conditions and the land will not be protected for individual use.’ Then the rebels left for their homes well pleased.⁶²

No-one from the Sunnī school would accuse ‘Alī of killing ‘Uthmān, but the fact is that the killers of ‘Uthmān were in ‘Alī’s camp and had control of Medina at the time of ‘Alī’s swearing in. This is the probable reason for Ibn ‘Abbas’ advising ‘Alī in the manner mentioned above. In addition, it is a historical fact that al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī was wounded while defending ‘Uthmān⁶³ making it unlikely that ‘Alī was involved in a plot

to kill ‘Uthmān when he had sent his own sons to defend him. ‘Alī also offered personally to defend ‘Uthmān, who refused the offer and said in his famous words: “I do not want blood to be spilt on my account.” ‘Alī had also said, according to the account of his son Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafīyyah: “May Allah curse the killers of ‘Uthmān on the earth and in the sea, the plains and the mountains.”⁶⁴

According to Ibādī sources, the fight continued until ‘Amr b. Muzāḥim al-Ansārī opened his house for those fighting ‘Uthmān. The house was adjoining ‘Uthmān's palace and they were able to enter it and kill ‘Uthmān. This happened on the 18th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah 35 A.H. The siege of ‘Uthmān's palace had lasted for about a month to forty days.⁶⁵

The Ibādī attitude to the caliphate of ‘Alī

The Ibādī sources give few details about the beginning of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib's caliphate. They assert that after the death of ‘Uthmān in his house in Medina, “the Muslims” gave their oath of allegiance to ‘Alī as the fourth caliph of the Muslims. In this way they indicate that they were perfectly satisfied with the way in which ‘Alī became caliph. In fact the sources maintain that ‘Alī's accession to the caliphate was legitimate because he was selected by *ahl al-ḥall wa-al-‘aqd*.⁶⁶ They pay little attention to the revolt of Ṭalḥah and al-Zubayr against ‘Alī other than to renounce those who fought against him and regard them as breaking their covenant.⁶⁷ The Ibādī sources do emphasise the order of ‘Alī after the Battle of the Camel where he told his supporters that they were not to

kill the wounded, pursue those who fled, take booty or the wives and the children of the defeated. The only things that they could take were those things, which had been used against them. In this way, ‘Alī was emphasising that his opponents were still Muslims of a kind, a view the Ibādīs also adopted.⁶⁸

However, it is the revolt of Mu‘āwiyah which is their main concern. Of course, they naturally condemn Mu‘āwiyah for his revolt but it is the circumstances of the Battle of Ṣiffīn and its aftermath that prompts them to give the fullest account of their claims as to what took place. In the Ibādī accounts of the battle of Siffīn, the way the Syrians put pages of the Qu’rān on their spears to call for arbitration is mentioned, and ‘Alī’s acceptance of this call.⁶⁹ However, they maintain that “the sincere Muslims” advised him against that. When the fighting stopped and ‘Abū Mūsā and ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ were appointed arbitrators, despite ‘Alī’s objections to ‘Abū Mūsā as arbitrator, the Ibādī sources remain silent. However, they then explain that the “sincere Muslims” realised the error of their ways in appointing human arbitrators in a matter which was subject to divine decision and therefore should be decided by the word of Allāh, the Qur’ān. They maintained that the dispute started in ‘Alī’s army. “The sincere Muslims” had refused from the start the arbitration that ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah had agreed upon.⁷⁰ They put forward the slogan *lā ḥukm illā li-Allāhi*, which means “there is no judgment except by Allāh.”⁷¹ By that, they claimed that they were following the Qur’ānic verse: “The command rests with none but Allāh. He declares the truth, and He is the best of judges.” (6:57)⁷² They accused ‘Alī of accepting the judgment of the people instead of Allāh’s judgement and such people must be fought because they are tyrants (*bughāt*).

They claimed Allāh had made clear in the Qur'ān and explained how the problem had to be dealt with in the verse: "If two parties among the believers fall into a quarrel, make peace between them, but if one of them transgresses beyond the bounds against the other, then fight you all against the one that transgresses until he complies, then make peace between them with justice, and be fair, for Allāh loves those who are fair [and just]" (49:9).⁷³ As a result of this attitude to arbitration one of the first to object to human arbitration when the arbitration agreement was read out was 'Urwah b. Udayyah b. Ḥadīr.⁷⁴ He declared that there is no judgement except by Allāh (*lā ḥukm illā li-Allāh*). This way to become a slogan of the Khārijites groups and of the Ibādīs in particular. Abū Bilāl Mirdas b. Udayyah b. Ḥadīr joined his brother in this protest. Both men were to demonstrate a commitment to this doctrine and to the views of the "sincere Muslims" with their own lives. In fact, Abū Bilāl becomes a model for the sacrificial aspect of the Ibādī movement.⁷⁵ The Ibādī sources mention that "the sincere Muslims" refused to accept the arbitration and claimed that 'Alī had lost his right to leadership by going against the commands of Allāh.⁷⁶ When the arbitration did take place, they continued in their refusal to accept it. They also continued to reject 'Alī's leadership. When 'Alī had insisted on accepting the arbitration, they met in 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb's house to discuss whom they should appoint as imam. At first they asked Ḥurqūs b. Zuhayr but he refused. They then asked 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī and he accepted to be the selected Imam for the "sincere Muslims," saying: "Give it to me, I swear by Allāh that I will not take the Imamate for the sake of worldly desire, nor will I refuse it to run from death." They gave him the oath of allegiance (*bay'ah*).⁷⁷

They gathered at Ḥarūrā', near Kūfah. The sources mention different numbers of "Muslims" at Ḥarūrā': some say there were ten or twelve thousand, others twenty-four thousand⁷⁸ but another source states that there were not more than five thousand.⁷⁹ It is claimed that they included the best of the Companions of the Prophet and the leaders of the Muslims as well as their Qur'ānic reciters and scholars (*'ulamā'*). Among them was Ḥurqūṣ b. Zuhayr, al-Sa'dī, 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī and a group of Muhājirīn and Anṣār.⁸⁰

According to Ibādī sources, when 'Alī got to know of their gathering, he sent to them asking them to come back to him. He wrote a letter requesting them to join him in fighting Mu'āwiyah. His letter went as follows:

From the Commander of the faithful, 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib to Zayd b. Ḥuṣn and 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī. I commend the praise of Allāh to you. The arbitrators neglected the Book of Allāh. They did not judge in accordance with what Allāh had revealed and Allāh is not responsible for their actions, nor is His Messenger, nor myself. Come back, you will get my goodwill. We will return to fight my enemy and yours and that was what you had requested from me before. The meeting place between us will be at Najrān."⁸¹

The two men replied to 'Alī with the following letter:

From the Commander of the Muslims, 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī and Zayd b. Ḥuṣn and the Muslims with them to 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib who has removed himself from his office. Peace is on those who follow the right path and avoid the wrong one. We have received your letter and you mentioned that the arbitrators had neglected the Book of Allāh and they did not judge in accordance with what Allāh had revealed. We knew that they were not on the right path. From the beginning, you had committed a greater sin than the arbitrators had by accepting the

arbitration. You also mentioned that you will return to what is right with goodwill and you will return to fighting. We do not deny your repentance. If you are sincere, you must do what the Muslims have done by obeying Allāh and His Messenger and obeying the Imam of the Muslims, ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī. We have given him the oath of allegiance, after we removed you from office because you deserved that.”⁸²

‘Alī sent Ibn ‘Abbās to them to discuss why they had withdrawn from ‘Alī’s army and gathered at Ḥarūrā’ near Kūfah. They argued with him and maintained that their path and position was right in the killing of ‘Uthmān, because he had committed unprecedented things (*aḥdāth*) and he had not followed the Book of Allāh. They were right in the killing of those who had participated in the Battle of the Camel (*jamal*) because they had broken their covenant, and they were not following the Book of Allāh. They said that they were right in killing the people of Syria because of their outrageous behaviour and their transgressing the requirements (*ḥudūd*) of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of the Prophet. They asked Ibn ‘Abbās if that was right or going astray. He replied that it was right.⁸³

“The Muslims” then asked him: "Is there any new order revealed from Allāh, which makes the first one unlawful?" He replied that there was not. They then asked why ‘Alī had accepted the arbitration in the religion of Allāh. Ibn ‘Abbās replied that they knew that Allāh had ordered arbitration between a man and a woman if they had a dispute within their marriage, also concerning a bird if killed during the pilgrimage. Then he suggested to them that it was more acceptable in a dispute in Muḥammad’s *ummah*. They said: "The judgment of the arbitrators regarding a man and a woman and a bird

was made the responsibility of just men by Allāh but the law regarding outrageous behaviour was decided by Allāh, for instance, in the cases of adultery, theft and false accusation of adultery (*qadhf*). No one can set his own judgement except Allāh. If the Imam wants to cut off the hand of a thief and the people told him to stop until he had got the opinion of the arbitrators, should he accept that or should he follow the law (*ḥukm*) of Allāh?" Ibn 'Abbās answered that he must follow the law of Allāh. They then asked whether Mu'āwiyah and 'Amr b al-'Aṣ had returned to Allāh's judgment?" He replied that they had not. They questioned whether 'Amr b al-'Aṣ had become just and stopped the hostility and tyranny (*baghī*) or had sold his religion to get Egypt? They pointed out that he had shed the blood of Muslims without any legal claim while Abū Mūsā was the man who had discouraged the people from war (*jihād*). Ibn 'Abbās was forced to agree. These men then declared: "If 'Amr is just and he is fighting us, we are wrong. If he is just, we testify that 'Ammār and those who were killed with him were false and straying from the right path."

After this discussion, Ibn 'Abbās went back to 'Alī and he told him that they had defeated his arguments on behalf of 'Alī.⁸⁴ Therefore 'Alī decided to go to them and to try to convince them himself. He told them that he had accepted the arbitration because the people of Syria had invited him to accept the decision of the Book of Allāh and he had accepted that. In support of his decision, he recited the Qur'ānic verse: "Have you not seen those who have been given a portion of scripture? They are being invited to the Book of Allāh to settle their dispute, then a party of them turned away, and they were averse." (3:23)⁸⁵ To this, they replied: "So you have given Mu'āwiyah the position

of a believer and yourself the position of the people of the Book as if they were inviting you to the Book of Allāh. If you are right, then the Book of Allāh says that they must be fought until they accept what is right.” Their argument was that the verse which ‘Alī had quoted referred to a dispute between the people of the Book and thus ‘Alī was making himself their equivalent. On the other hand, if ‘Alī was accepting that arbitration could take place between two believers, he was granting Mu‘āwiyah the status of a believer, which was unacceptable to them since they considered Mu‘āwiyah to have ceased to be a believer by his rebellion against ‘Alī and his other wicked acts. The Ibādī sources then report ‘Alī as claiming that it was they who were the party which had demanded that he should not fight the people who invited him to accept the Book of Allāh, while he had rejected that and told them that it was a trick. He also claimed that when he wanted to send a man who would be able to solve all the problems that Mu‘āwiyah would create they had rejected that and insisted on Abū Mūsa. At this point the sources seem to admit that they may have been involved in the actions mentioned by ‘Alī because the reply given has some ambiguity: “The Muslims simply said that they had told their brothers what was right and that they had repented before Allāh for any mistake that they had made.”⁸⁶

Then swiftly they terminated the discussion with the words *Allāhu akbar* and left. However, it should be noted that one source claimed that al-Ash‘ath b. Qays had kept on persuading ‘Alī until he accepted the arbitration. Mu‘āwiyah also continued to send letters to the people of ‘Iraq, promising them worldly life if they urged ‘Alī to accept arbitration. This would seem to deny their involvement in persuading ‘Alī to accept

arbitration. However, the sources do admit that some of those at Ḥarūrā' returned to 'Alī's army and the others withdrew from Ḥarūrā'.

According to Ibādī sources, the result of the arbitration was such that 'Alī rejected it. He wanted to mobilise forces against Mu'āwiyah. The "sincere Muslims" were reluctant to fight alongside 'Alī against Mu'āwiyah. They had rejected 'Alī as their leader and they felt that he had not shown true repentance for accepting the arbitration. On the other hand, they totally rejected Mu'āwiyah. Their solution to the problem was to withdraw (*kharaja*) from both parties and assemble in al-Nahrawān. Thousands of them gathered there. Although they did not claim to be fighting against 'Alī and his supporters, the presence of so many armed men within Iraq who claimed to be independent of him, presented a potential military threat to 'Alī. The latter probably felt that if he gained victory over Mu'āwiyah he could win them over to his side. However, there were others who did not take such a view. Mu'āwiyah was doing his best to undermine 'Alī's position through bribery and the Kūfan leaders were reluctant to go against the Syrians while "the Muslims" were at al-Nahrawān. In fact al-Ash'ath insisted that he was not prepared to advance against the Syrians while those at al-Nahrawān were still there.⁸⁷

'Alī sent his son al-Hasan to them. Al-Ḥasan tried to persuade them to return and accept 'Alī as their Imam but they refused and declared that by accepting the arbitration 'Alī had removed himself from being the Imam. However, according to the Ibādī

sources, they still urged ‘Alī to go against Mu‘āwiyah. This would seem to suggest that although they had gathered at al-Nahrawān under a new Imam, ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī, they were simply withdrawing support from ‘Alī and did not intend to fight him unless he fought them.⁸⁸

After al-Ḥasan’s failure to persuade them to return, ‘Alī sent Qays b. Sa’d to them. He argued that ‘Alī’s judgment was in accordance with the Book of Allāh. However, they pointed out that his representative at the arbitration had removed him from office. Thus ‘Alī had only acted when the result did not go in his favour and his power was taken from him. Qays asked whether, if ‘Alī came to them and repented, they would kill him as they had killed ‘Uthmān. They told him that ‘Alī was the one who had killed ‘Uthmān through his orders. He said: “I will bring him to you.” They were delighted with this reply and Qays left them.

It was then that ‘Alī brought his army up opposite the people of al-Nahrawān. According to the Ibāḍī sources, ‘Alī urged his army to attack the people of al-Nahrawān. On the other hand, the people of al-Nahrawān would not begin the battle and would only fight ‘Alī’s forces if they were attacked in order to defend themselves. The people of al-Nahrawān gathered round ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī and asked if anybody was going to Paradise. They were ready to die.

In the meantime ‘Alī was standing watching. With ‘Alī was Dhu al-Qasiyyah.⁸⁹ He heard ‘Alī saying that these were the people of *al-Dār* on the day of *al-Dār* (i.e. they

were present at the siege of ‘Uthmān) and the people of the Camel at the day of the Camel and the people of Şiffin on the day of Şiffin and the people of the Qur’ān when it is recited. At this Dhū al-Qasiyyah struck his horse and rode across to join them. A son of ‘Adī b. Ḥatim asked about Zayd b. Ḥuşn. He was told that he was with the people of al-Nahrawān, so he too followed them.

The battle commenced when ‘Alī’s troops launched an attack on the people of al-Nahrawān lasting all day. At the end of the battle, most of the people of al-Nahrawān were dead. The Ibāḍī sources claim that among those killed were the best people on the face of the earth. Among them was Thumālah, a Companion of the Prophet.⁹⁰

After the battle of al-Nahrawān, Ibn ‘Abbās was told by Qanbar, ‘Alī’s servant, that Alī remained crying for a long time. When asked why he was crying, ‘Alī said that at this spot the best of the *ummah* and its Qur’anic reciters had been killed. He continued to weep for a long time and said that he had acted in anger and was sad for having killed the people of al-Nahrawān. One man accused ‘Alī of being like: “Those whose efforts have been wasted in this life while they thought they were acquiring good by their deeds” (18:104). However, ‘Alī answered that that referred to those who were the people of the Torah and the Gospels. Another man said: “I swear by Allāh that there is no path between the two. If the arbitration was right, you went astray because you did not fulfil your covenant and rejected the arbitrators. If it was wrong, you were astray

because of the killing of the people of al-Nahrawān when they tried to stop you from going astray.⁹¹

According to Ibādī sources, ‘Adī b. Ḥatim told ‘Alī that he had put them in such a position that they did not know where to turn. He had killed those who accepted the arbitration and those who rejected it. When his son al-Ḥasan came to ‘Alī at Kūfah, he said: “O, my father, have you killed them?” He answered, “Yes.” Al-Ḥasan said: “whoever had killed them did not deserve to go to Paradise.” ‘Alī replied that he hoped to enter Paradise even by creeping (*ḥabw*).⁹² When ‘Alī missed the reciters of the Qur’ān he said that they were the lions (*usūd*) of the day and the monks (*ruhbān*) of the night. Ibn ‘Abbās said to al-Ḥasan that his family deserved to get lost like the children of Israel.⁹³ First ‘Alī had stood for the Book of Allāh and had taken part in *jihād*. Then he had accepted the arbitration over the Book of his Lord and killed the best from among the Muslims, and their religious scholars who had become thin and weak through their worship and had spent their wealth and souls in the land of Allāh.

When ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd b. Shaddād came to Medina, ‘Ā’ishah asked him, “Has ‘Alī killed his colleagues?” He told her the story and she asked who was with them. He named for her Ḥurqūs b. Zuhayr al-Sa’dī and Zayd b. Ḥuṣn. She said that if the *ummaḥ* agreed to supply the spear that killed Zayd, Allāh would put them in Hell.⁹⁴

According to the Ibādī sources, ‘Alī’s victory over the people of al-Nahrawān was the turning-point in his caliphate. Discontent spread through his army at what they had done to “sincere Muslims,” many deserted and ‘Alī’s forces were seriously depleted. ‘Alī wanted to advance against the Syrians but men like al-Ash‘ath urged that they return to Kūfah. ‘Alī ordered his force to assemble at al-Nukhaylah but many instead returned to Kūfah.⁹⁵ In the meantime, Mu‘āwiyah was, of course, delighted. ‘Alī had defeated and killed many of those who were fiercely hostile to Mu‘āwiyah and his aims. The loyalty of his own forces and the disunity and disenchantment of ‘Alī’s forces enabled him to make substantial inroads into ‘Alī’s authority. Mu‘āwiyah gained control of Egypt, Yemen and Ḥijāz, killed ‘Alī’s governors and used his influence to further undermine ‘Alī’s precarious control over Iraq.

In the Ibādī view, the survivors of the Battle of al-Nahrawān were profoundly distressed at the the slaughter of their colleagues which ‘Alī had perpetrated. They grieved for them and plotted for what they regarded as rightful vengeance for their unjustified killing. It was under these circumstance that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muljam, a survivor of the Battle of al-Nahrawān, waylaid ‘Alī as he entered the mosque and killed him. The Ibādī’s justify Ibn Muljam’s actions by claiming that ‘Alī, by his attack on the people of al-Nahrawān, had forfeited any right to life and killing him was a righteous act of revenge.⁹⁶

The Ibādī attitude toward Mu'āwiyah and the Umayyad

According to the Ibādī sources, when 'Alī was killed his son al-Ḥasan was selected as caliph but Mu'āwiyah deceived him just as he had deceived his father. Mu'āwiyah wrote to him: "I swear by Allāh that you are more honourable to me than my son. Let me have the caliphate and obey me because I am older than you and I will make sure that you will become caliph after me. Let us end this dispute and war."⁹⁷

It appears from the Ibādī sources that some of the survivors of al-Nahrawān, together with others who were appalled at what had taken place, had gathered at al-Nukhaylah. After al-Ḥasan agreed to step down he helped Mu'āwiyah to fight the people of al-Nukhaylah. When Mu'āwiyah went toward al-Nukhaylah, he was met by the people there and they invited him to the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of his Prophet and the way of unity (*jamā'ah*). Mu'āwiyah refused. They fought with him until a large number of his army had been killed. Mu'āwiyah shouted, "O people of Kūfah, is it treason?" Then al-Ḥasan and the people of Kūfah came and joined him in his fight against the people of al-Nukhaylah and they were defeated.⁹⁸

On his abdication al-Ḥasan had said to his followers: "You have given me the oath of allegiance to fight whoever fights me and to make peace with whom I have made peace, and I have made peace with Mu'āwiyah. So be peaceful with him and obey him."⁹⁹ Thus, although they do not recognise al-Ḥasan's caliphate, the Ibādī sources consider al-Ḥasan to be wrong in making peace with Mu'āwiyah. They said that al-Ḥasan had

sold the Hereafter for worldly pleasure. They quote the Qur'ān: "Incline not toward those who do wrong, lest the fire should touch you, and you have no protectors other than Allāh." (11:113).¹⁰⁰ They also quoted: "And obey neither a sinner nor a disbeliever among them." (76:24).¹⁰¹ When the news of al-Ḥasan's abdication reached Ibn 'Abbās, he got very angry and told al-Ḥasan that he was from an Arab family who deserved to be like those who got lost in the desert for forty years because they had claimed to be acting in accordance with the Book of Allāh and His Prophet's Sunnah. He said: "You fought the tyrant group and then you stopped people from fighting them and you became afraid like the Israelites who were afraid to enter the village."¹⁰²

To the Ibādīs, Mu'āwiyah's appointment of his son Yazīd was another clear indication that al-Ḥasan had been deceived by Mu'āwiyah and that Mu'āwiyah was the evil man which they claimed him to be. The Ibādī attitude to Yazīd is more virulent than even that to Mu'āwiyah. The Ibādī sources vilify Yazīd.¹⁰³

Throughout the caliphates of Mu'āwiyah and Yazīd, there were sporadic revolts in Kūfah and Baṣrah. These were brutally suppressed by Ziyād b. Abīhi and his son, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād, particularly in Baṣrah. It is the revolts in Baṣrah which are of most concern to the Ibādīs. Although they are described as "revolts," this is perhaps an inaccurate term. The main features of them are that groups of dissatisfied Muslims met secretly together. The authorities became concerned and began to watch them very closely. There were confrontations in the mosque and complaints were raised against the maladministration of the authorities. Under some provocation, groups of dissatisfied Muslims go out (*kharaja*) from the camp cities of Kūfah and Baṣrah. They were

pursued by the authorities. As a result, these groups were eventually defeated, usually after brave resistance.¹⁰⁴

One of these revolts is of particular importance to the Ibādīs. It is that of Abū Bilāl Mirdas b. Udayyah. He had been present at Şiffīn with his brother ‘Urwah b. Udayyah. In fact, the latter had been the first to protest against the arbitration with the slogan, "There is no judgement except for Allah." Both had survived the Battles of al-Nahrawān and al-Nukhaylah and were living in Baṣrah.¹⁰⁵ ‘Urwah b. Udayyah had the temerity to approach ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād when he was governor of Baṣrah and reproach him for five grave sins that he had committed. Ibn Ziyād thought that this was the beginning of a revolt against himself and immediately withdrew. ‘Urwah considered that his words had drawn attention to himself and decided to go into hiding. Ibn Ziyād, when sure of his own security, did act violently. ‘Urwah was discovered and cruelly put to death with his daughter. As he died, he said: "You have spoiled this world for me but I have spoiled the next for you."¹⁰⁶

It is reported that Abū Bilāl was also involved in a public dispute with ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād. Abū Bilāl was present in the mosque when Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād said: "I will take those who did not commit any mistake instead of those who have. I will punish those who are present instead of the absent ones." Abū Bilāl stood up and told ‘Ubayd Allāh that what he had said had not been mentioned by Allāh in the Qur’ān. Allāh had said: "And of Ibrahim who fulfilled his engagements, namely that no one who is a bearer of burdens can bear the burden of another; that the man can have nothing but

what he strives for, that his striving will soon come into sight. Then he will be rewarded with a complete reward." (53: 37- 41) On this occasion Abū Bilāl seems to have avoided Ibn Ziyād's anger.¹⁰⁷

On another occasion, Abū Bilāl gave advice to a woman called Baljah which stressed his peaceful attitude. This woman used to encourage people to revolt against 'Ubayd Allāh. She spoke publicly of his injustice. Abū Bilāl went to her and told her that Allāh had given a Muslim protection in *taqiyyah*. He also said that there is nothing wrong with *taqiyyah*. Therefore, she should keep her views secret. She said: "I am afraid that someone will be harmed because of me but if Ibn Ziyād killed me that would be worse for him." The advice was to no avail. Baljah kept criticising 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād and calling on people to revolt against him. 'Ubayd Allāh acted against her with brutality and she met a martyr's death in the market place of Baṣrah.¹⁰⁸

Abū Bilāl was present at her execution. Clearly his activities must have become more public as he was arrested by 'Ubayd Allāh and put in prison. Although he was later released from prison, Abū Bilāl had seen too much repression from 'Ubayd Allāh. He could not bear any more and decided to openly withdraw (*kharaja*) from the latter's authority. In effect, he decided to sacrifice his life to show his abhorrence at what was being done to "sincere Muslims."¹⁰⁹

According to Ibādī sources, he was closely associated with another important figure in the Ibādī movement, Jābir b. Zayd, who will be discussed in the next chapter.¹¹⁰ In

fact, Jābir is said to have commended the revolt of Abū Bilāl. Before his revolt Abū Bilāl is reported to have said: "I wish that I had two souls so that I could use one to fight in the way of Allāh and the other to take care of the affairs of the Muslims."¹¹¹

In the year 60 A.H., Abū Bilāl withdrew from Baṣrah with forty men and went to Ahwaz. He no longer felt it possible to live in Baṣrah under 'Ubayd Allāh. He made clear non-aggressive attitude he made clear and his intention not to harm anyone. However, he felt that he and his followers had a legitimate claim to a share in the taxes as a result of 'Umar's distribution in the *diwān* system. He intercepted a caravan and took the amount that he and his followers deemed their right.¹¹² He left the rest and allowed the caravan to continue. This defiance was too much for 'Ubayd Allāh to accept. He sent an army of two thousand against Abū Bilāl and his forty men at Asak, but Abū Bilāl defeated them. In the next year, 'Ubayd Allāh sent an army of four thousand under 'Abbād b. Ashdar. They defeated Abū Bilāl and the latter died bravely. However, some of those sympathetic to Abū Bilāl murdered the victorious 'Abbād b. Ashdar as he entered Baṣrah on his return.

Abū Bilāl became an important figure in the Ibāḍī movement. He seems to have represented two of the major aspects of that movement: an encouragement to keep quiet in the face of extreme danger as he showed in his advice to Baljah; and a willingness to sacrifice one's own life as he did.¹¹³

The Ibādī attitude toward the Khārijites

When Mu'āwiyah died, his son became caliph, thus giving a clear sign that al-Ḥasan had been deceived by him. After that a group of Muslims under the leadership of Muzāḥim confronted the Umayyads, but were killed in the manner of the people of al-Nahrawān and al-Nukhaylah. There was continuous struggle and opposition by those who were true to the Islamic precepts, even though many of them were killed. The first to rise in active opposition was Ziyād b. Jarās al-'Ajalī, who launched his campaign from Kūfah, and after him came Tamīm b. Salamah.

The second opposing faction started from Baṣrah under the leadership of Ṭawwāf b. al-'Alā', but they were killed by 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād. After them, Qarīb b. Murrah al-Azdī and Zaḥḥāf al-Ṭā'ī rose;¹¹⁴ then came Abū Bilāl b. Ḥadīr al-Tamīmī who witnessed Ṣiffīn with his brother 'Urwah and thereupon rejected the arbitration thereat.¹¹⁵

The Ibādīs regard all of the minor uprisings which occurred in Kūfah and Baṣrah as legitimate revolts against an illegitimate authority. They do not give much detail of these revolts, which have been described fully in al-Ṭabarī and analysed by Wellhausen. The important point that emerges is that they regard all of the Khārijite revolts as acceptable in terms of the individual's choice to fight against tyranny and the corruption

of Islam. They regard this form of *khurūj* as legitimate and in no way to be a moving outside of Islam; these revolts were carried out by “sincere Muslims.”

However, much attention is paid to the leader Abū Bilāl. He is described as having accepted the idea that “sincere Muslims” may not necessarily have to rise with the sword against oppression, although he himself sacrificed his life in order to try and put matters right.¹¹⁶ The “sincere Muslims” come to the fore at the time of the siege of Mecca against Ibn al-Zubayr in 64 A.H. Here we meet three leaders of the movement who supported Ibn al-Zubayr in the hope that he would join them, namely, ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ, Nāfi‘ b. al-Azraq and ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣaffār. At this stage all three are regarded as being within the fold of the “sincere Muslims”. No doctrinal differences had emerged between them.

Thus, it could be seen that the “sincere Muslims” at this stage regarded themselves as representing the continuity of Islam which had been disrupted by the actions of ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī and al-Ḥasan, Mu‘āwiyah and Yazīd.¹¹⁷ However, as Ibn Ibāḍ said: “They were more hostile and angry with those who came after them.”¹¹⁸ They laid great stress on their position as reciters (*qurrā*) of the Qur’ān and emphasised the importance of the Qur’ān in every sense. Although they accepted the *Sunnah* of the Prophet, there was clearly some difficulty for the Ibāḍīs in this acceptance as there are reports that describe the Khārijites as having deviated from true Islam.

The other aspect that seems to have been present in their doctrines at this time was that, while the sacrifice of one's life against tyrants was an ultimate ideal, it was not wrong to conceal one's belief in the face of oppression. However, it should be noted that they regarded themselves as being the true Muslims, keeping Islam alive in the midst of oppression by tyrants and their supporters.¹¹⁹ At this point, it is necessary to understand how they felt about those Muslims who did not hold their views. In general they were not regarded as having committed *shirk*, the ultimate act of apostasy from Islam. However, they did regard them as *kuffār*. It is doubtful whether this word should actually be translated as 'unbelievers' in this context, particularly as it is coupled with *al-ni'mah*. They are classed as *kuffār al-ni'mah*, which would seem to mean that they are characterised as being those who have shown their ingratitude for Allāh's bounty, which is one of the meanings of *kufr*. Thus, the other Muslims are seen as having rejected much that Allāh has given them, but as still having a residual state of belief in Allāh and the religion which He revealed to Muḥammad.

Up until 64 A.H. the Ibādīs considered those who were known as Khārijites by the rest of the Muslims to be in fact only termed that because they had refused to accept tyranny, oppression and the corruption of religion. Ibn Ibād says in his letter:

This is the account (*khavar*) of the Khārijites and we make Allāh and his Angels our witnesses that whoever became their enemy, we are his enemies. Whoever is loyal to them we are loyal to him with our hands, hearts and tongues. We will live by that as long as we live and we will die by that.¹²⁰

At this stage the Ibādīs were opposed to the view that the Khārijites were exceeding the limits of Islam and distinguishing themselves from the Muslims (*ahl al-Islam*). They

argue that they did not in fact accept the changing of the *Sunnah*, nor were neglectful of the judgement (*ḥukm*) of Allāh and thus disobedient to Him. Accordingly, they assert that they were a faction that refused to accept the judgement of men over that of Allāh.¹²¹

Again, Ibn Ibāḍ describes the Khārijites in his letter thus:

They were those who obeyed Allāh and followed His orders and the *Sunnah* of His Prophet, and followed the *sīrah* of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Their enemies were those who disobeyed Allāh and did not follow his orders and the *Sunnah* of the Prophet and the *sīrah* of the two rightly guided Caliph. They were in full agreement and followed each other. They recognised the preference for each other. They were enjoining good and forbidding wrong. They fought the people of discord. They were guided to the right path.¹²²

For Ibn Ibāḍ, and the Ibāḍīs after him, the Khārijite movement as a movement of extremists began with Nāfi‘ b. al-Azraq. It was he who divided the movement representing the sincere Muslims, deviated from their agenda and denounced those who did not revolt with him. Ibn al-Azraq introduced discord and caused the first division among the sincere Muslims.¹²³ He adopted the following doctrines, which were rejected by Ibn Ibāḍ and the Ibāḍīs:

1. Other Muslims were subjected to an investigation (*isti‘rāḍ*) of their faith. If their views were not in agreement with the Khārijite doctrines, they were killed.
2. It was lawful to take booty and children from defeated Muslims, again regarding them as polytheists.
3. Muslims could be fought without first summoning them to accept their views.

4. Khārijites considered themselves to be emigrants, in defiance of the view of the Prophet who said: "There was no emigration after the conquest of Mecca."
5. Khārijites refused to carry out the *ḥadd* penalty for adultery. (Presumably, because it is not mentioned in the Qur'ān.)
6. Because Khārijites regarded the other Muslims as polytheists, they would not marry their women nor eat the meat of an animal slaughtered by them.¹²⁴

The other supporter of Ibn al-Zubayr at Mecca, 'Abd Allāh b. Ṣaffār did not accept all of Ibn al-Azraq's views. However, he did accept that the other Muslims were polytheists, that it was permitted to take booty from them and that other Muslims should be subjected to an investigation of their faith and killed if their views were not in accordance with those of Ibn al-Azraq.

A breakaway from Ibn al-Azraq occurred under Najdah b. 'Amir al-Ḥanafī. The main point of difference between the two was over the issue of the necessity of taking part in *khurūj*. Najdah maintained that those who accepted their agenda, but did not join them in fighting were hypocrites, but that it was unlawful to take their wealth and blood on the basis of the Qur'ānic verse: "But if they repent, perform the prayer and pay the *zakah*, they are your brother in religion" (9:11).¹²⁵

After this, the Khārijite movement seems to have become split into various minor groups, all of which regarded the other Muslims as polytheists. Thus Ibn Ibād's emphasis on *kufṛ-al-ni'mah* shows an important distinction between the Ibādīs and the

Khārijites. The other major distinction was that only Najdah, among the Khārijites, gave his followers permission not to take part in armed struggle.

As a result of the *aḥādīths* reported by Jābir Ibn Zayd, the Ibāḍīs began to take greater interest in the Prophetic *ḥadīths*. Ibn Ibāḍ makes the Ibāḍī attitude towards Ibn al-Azraq and other Khārijites clear when he says: “We are innocent of what Ibn al-Azraq and his followers did. It seems to me that they were Muslims but they became unbelievers and we disassociate ourselves from them.”¹²⁶ Interestingly, the second century traditionaist Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb reported a tradition, versions of which have been interpreted by many Sunnīs as referring to the Khārijites, including the Ibāḍīs:

A group will appear amongst you, Muslims. You will think little of your prayers in comparison with them, you will think little of your fasting in comparison with theirs and you will think little of your actions in comparison with their deeds. They read the Qur’ān but it does not pass beyond their larynxes. They pass through (*yamraqun*) Islam like an arrow.¹²⁷

This tradition is applied by the Ibāḍīs to the extremists whom they refer to as *al-māriqah*¹²⁸ or *khawārij al-jawr*.¹²⁹ The hostility of the Ibāḍīs to this group is further demonstrated by the later Ibāḍī accusation that these groups had gone beyond *kufṛ-al-ni‘mah* and had become polytheists (*mushrikūn*). The Ibāḍīs also argue that the only group of Khārijites who remain on the right path are the Ibāḍīs. They call themselves ‘the Muslims’ and *Ahl-al-Istiḳāmah*.

The later Ibādīs accepted the meaning of *khurūj* if it were taken in a political sense. The Ibādīs stated various meanings for *khurūj* as the follows:

1. To move out of Islam by rejecting the definite teachings of Islam (*inkār al-thabit al-qaṭī' min aḥkām al-sharī'ah*) or to deviate from Islam fully.¹³⁰
2. To undertake a political revolt against the state by breaking the oath of allegiance for reasons known to those who revolt.¹³¹
3. To revolt for the sake of Allāh (*al-khurūj fī sabīl Allah*) against injustice (*ẓulm*), oppression and unbelief (*kufr*) while citing an interpretation of the following verse in support: “and if they had intended to come out (for *jihad*), they would certainly have made some preparation for it”(9.46).

This verse explains the situation of those who did not participate in the battle of Tabūk, especially the hypocrites. It encourages Muslims to be ready for *jihād*, and this is taken by the Ibādīs to be a form of *khurūj*. After citing the previous verse, an Ibādī scholars stated: “History did not prove that the Ibādīs had moved out of Islam.”¹³² So, this is an indication that they are not extreme Khārijites, indeed, the Ibādīs agreed with other Muslims that al-Azāriqah and al-Najdāt were extreme. They were understood as having moved out of Islam (*marqū min al-dīn*) due to their wrong understanding and interpretation (*ta'wīl bāṭil*) of the verses of the Qu'rān.¹³³ However, they are not considered to be Khārijites as a result of their revolt against 'Alī after the arbitration.¹³⁴

Thus, the khārijites, from the point of view of the Ibādīs are those who are outside the boundaries of Islam, and as we have seen, the Khārijites themselves separated and divided into different groups, some of which are extreme.

The dispute is based on variations in the understanding of the Qur'ān and *sharī'ah* and the attitude of those who revolted towards those who did not. The Khārijites, according to Ibādīs, are polytheists for the following reasons: Their misinterpretation (*ta'wīl fāsid*) of the Qur'ānic verse: “ If you obey them then you are polytheist or pagans like them.” (6:121) The meaning of the verse is that the Muslims are forbidden to eat the meat of dead animals (*maytah*) that have not been slaughtered. However, the Khārijites understood this as constituting permission to shed the blood of the Muslims, and to take their wealth by force (*nahab*). To enslave Muslim men and woman because they were pagans in their understanding required that they had to legalise what Allāh had forbidden.¹³⁵ The Ibādī have denounced the Khārijites since the time of ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibād, and as we have seen, the facts indicate that there is no relation and connection between the extreme Khārijites and the Ibādī. It seems to me that the Ibādī are trying to distance themselves from the extreme khārijites because of their militant history, while it is well known that the Ibādī and the khārijites can be traced back to a common origin; the people of al-Nahrawān. In conclusion the Khārijites are, in the Ibādī view are those who are outside the boundaries of Islam.

It is generally accepted that a revolt against any imam is not considered to be *murūq min al-dīn*.¹³⁶ ‘Alī did not consider those who revolted against him to be *kuffār*, pagans or hypocrites, saying only that, “Our brothers revolted against us.”¹³⁷ Ibāḍīs adopt the same view, taken from ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ, in accord with their position that these extreme Khārijites were part of the main body of Muslims but that they subsequently moved out of Islam by rejecting various of its principles.¹³⁸ Ibāḍīs have held the same view up until the present day.

The Khārijites have divided into different groups since the time of al-Nahrawān. It is worth noting that Ibāḍīs hold to the opinion of ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ toward other Muslims when he applies the term *kufṛ* to them, specifically *kufār-bi-al-ni‘am*. This meant in effect that they forbid the taking of the wealth of other Muslims in the form of *saby* and booty, and deal with them as Muslims.¹³⁹ This represents another distinction between the Ibāḍīs and the extreme Khārijites.¹⁴⁰

Al-Kindī¹⁴¹ said:

The highest status is consecrated to the righteous people who adhere firmly to the *Sunnah* of the Prophet and the teachings of the Holy Qur’ān. Indeed, these are the Ibāḍīs who, unlike the apostates and polytheists, followed the right path and the true teachings of Islam. Actually, they established justice, and have never gone astray from the teachings of the Prophet. Hence, they were granted mercy and forgiveness and shall be in the company of the prophets, and the righteous and the martyrs in paradise. Thus, whoever dies believing in the religion of Allāh and the way of the people of al-Nahrawān, whoever dies following the way of *al-Muḥakkimah*, is granted paradise, and whoever is contrary to this belief will be in hellfire.¹⁴²

The Khārijites, as already noted we divided initially into three major groups, and subsequently splintered into further subgroups.¹⁴³ The Ibādī account of this is as follows.

The group is known as Al-‘Aṭawīyyah were named after Aṭṭīyah b. Aswad, who lived in Sijistān and there committed very strange acts. The Ibādīs do not give any details about this group but they accuse Aṭṭīyah b Aswad of introducing innovations and confirm that he went astray. It is worth noting that he was one of the followers of Ibn al-Azraq.¹⁴⁴

The group known as al-‘Asamiyyah were led by Ziyād al-‘Asam. He resented the behaviour of al-Azariqah, al-Najdiyyah and al-‘Aṭawīyyah and he cursed them for adopting strange concepts which were not in accordance with Islam. However, he followed some of their ideas, especially emigration for his people. He likened the fighting of Muslims who differed with him to fighting the *mushrikīn* and he allowed his followers to kill them both openly and secretly. He derived this doctrine from his misunderstanding of the verse: “...Then kill *mushrikīn* wherever you find them.” (9:5) And he made it lawful to take booty and take them as *saby*. It is common among the extreme Khārijites for them to kill one another and to consider those who differ from them as *mushrikīn*.¹⁴⁵

The group known as al-Ṣāliḥīyyah was named after Ṣāliḥ b. Musarraḥ. He made it lawful to kill and to take the children of Muslims as *saby* and spoils of war, especially

those whose views differed from his own. This group divided into two sub-groups; some remained with Ṣāliḥ, while others joined Abū Bahīs.¹⁴⁶

Al-Bahīsiyyah¹⁴⁷ this group were led by Abū Bahīs al-Hayḍam b. Jābir. He allowed his followers to marry from the Magis (Majians), to eat birds which had claws (i.e. birds of prey) and *siba* with fangs (animals of prey) according to his understanding of the verse: "Say, O Muhammad, I find not in that which has been inspired to me anything forbidden to be eaten by one who wishes to eat it, unless it is a dead animal or bloodshed or the flesh of a swine." (6.145) One of the strange notions that he had was that if the Imam became a disbeliever, then the whole nation automatically became disbelievers, whether they were present or absent.¹⁴⁸

The leader of al-‘Ajradiyyah was ‘Abd Karīm b. ‘Ajrād. He was a member of al-Bahīsiyyah, but fell into a dispute with them regarding the status of a child in relation to *barā’ah*; specifically that children should be exempted until they became adults. Then he and his supporters were invited into Islam (i.e. the Khārijite version). He also said: "They cannot take the booty unless the owner was killed and he considered emigration as a good deed, but not compulsory as the others had regarded it. He sees those who commit a great sin (*kabirah*) as *Kafir al-ni‘mah* like the Ibāḍīs¹⁴⁹ He denied the existence of Surat Yusuf in the Qur’ān, but the reason behind this denial is not known.¹⁵⁰

Al-Maymuniyyah was a group led by Maymun, who was a member of al-‘Ajradiyyah. He considered the fate of man to be unalterable, whether good or evil. He also denied the existence of Surat Yusuf and He said that the children of Muslims and non-Muslims would enter paradise.¹⁵¹

The group known as Aṣfariyyah was Named after Ziyad b. Aṣfar.¹⁵² He did not consider those who did not fight with him as *kāfir* if they were in agreement with him and accepted his understanding. He forbade the killing of the children of unbelievers during war. He considered *taqiyyah* to exist in speech but not in deed. This group was divided into Shamrakhiyyah and al-Tha‘alibiyyah.¹⁵³

Al-Ḥaṣṣiyyah were the followers of Ḥaṣṣ b. Abū Al-Miqdām. He asserted that the difference between *imān* and polytheism lies in the knowledge of Allāh alone and that whoever knows Him and disbelieves in the Book and the Messenger and the day of judgement and paradise and hellfire and commits a great sin like adultery or theft, is *kāfir* but not polytheist.¹⁵⁴

Al-Tha‘alibiyyah: They were the followers of ‘Abd al Karīm b. ‘Ajrād. The split came when their leader, Tha‘labah, differed with him over whether or not to associate with a child; Thalaba stated that he would not associate with a child until they became an adult. The counter argument was that by this stage the child may have rejected what is right and accepted the unjust and would rebel and renounce them at this later stage.¹⁵⁵

Al-Akhnasiyyah were led by Al-Akhnas b. Qays. He was a member of al-Thalibiyyah. He said that he would not denounce those who were under concealment (*taqiyyah*). He subsequently asserted that he would associate with those that had *imān* and those who were not believers he would renounce. He made it lawful to marry from among the *saby* of those who had committed a great sin among his people. He forbade the killing of Muslims, and stealing from them, until he had summoned them into the religion; if they refused they would be fought, at which point he would take *saby* and booty from them.¹⁵⁶

Al-Ḥāzimiyyah were named after Ḥāzim b. ‘Alī or Shu‘īb b. Ḥāzim. His faith was based on the belief that Allāh created the acts of human beings, whether right or wrong, in common with the Ibādīs. He also said that Allāh loved the servant whose actions at the end of his life are pleasing to Him. He hates those with actions that lead them, at the end of their lives, to disbelieve, because Allah loves those who obeyed him during their lives, and hates those who disobey him. He considered the *saby* and the booty from Muslims lawful. His stance toward ‘Alī is that he did not denounce him, contrary to that of the Khārijites.¹⁵⁷

Al-Khalafiyyah were named after Khalaf Al-Khārijī who lived with his followers in Karmān and Makrān. His understanding of destiny (*qadr*) was that it was all from Allah, its right and its wrong, again in accordance with the understanding of the Ibādī. He stated that if Allāh punished people for deeds that were done in accordance with

inevitable fate, it would be unjust. He asserted that the children of non-Muslims would be in hellfire when they died.¹⁵⁸

Al-Sa'diyyah were the followers of Sa'īd b. Muhammad. He was a member of al-'Ajaridah but fell into a dispute with them over matters related to *qadr* and denounced them. Part of his understanding in this regard was that Allāh has created the actions of human beings, but that the individual is responsible for his own actions, whether right or wrong, and this is in agreement with the Ibādīs. He also considered the *saby* and the booty lawful if taken from a Muslim, in common with the other groups of Khārijites.¹⁵⁹

Conclusion

For the Ibādīs, their interpretation of these early years of Islamic history are crucial for the later elaboration of their political and constitutional theory. At this stage, their description of events indicates that the core of their criticism of 'Uthmān was his violation of the Qur'ān. They do mention his breaches of the Sunnah of the Prophet and the practices of Abū Bakr and 'Umar as well as his introduction of bad innovations (*aḥdāth*). However, it is the Qur'ān that they cite, not the *ḥadīth*. According to them, "the Muslims" did not revolt against 'Uthmān, they merely advised him and threatened to remove him from office. It was 'Uthmān's intention to have them killed that justified his death.

Similarly, in their eyes, 'Alī's great sin had been to violate the Qur'ān by accepting an arbitration with wrongdoers when he should have followed the instructions of the Qur'ān. "The Muslims" withdrew from 'Alī; they did not revolt against him. It was 'Alī's attack on them and slaughter of so many of them that justified his death.

As far as Mu'āwiyah and his son Yazīd were concerned, they felt that they were completely outside Islam. However, the revolts against them were not aggressive revolts but simply a withdrawal from their authority by those who could no longer tolerate living under that authority. They were peaceful to the extent that they only fought when attacked.

After the death of Yazīd and the eventual succession of 'Abd al-Malik, the Ibādī movement continued its twofold policy of secrecy and revolt. This will be discussed in the following chapters when the careers of Jābir b. Zayd, Ibn Ibād and Abū 'Ubaydah will be examined.

¹ 'Abd Allāh b. Ibād, *Sirāt 'Abd Allāh b. Ibād, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt* (ed. Kāshif, S. I.), vol II, 328; Muḥammad b. Maḥbūb, *Sirat Muḥammad b. Maḥbūb*, vol II, 223; Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *Sirat al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs*, vol. II, 302.

² 'Abd Allāh b. Ibād, *Sirāt 'Abd Allāh b. Ibād, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt* (ed. Kāshif, S. I.), vol II, 336; Ibn Sallām, *al-Islam min Wajhat Naẓār al-Ibādīyyah*, 105.

³ Al-Qalhātī, *al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān*, vol II, 207.

⁴ *Ibn Ibād*, op.cit., 335; Al-Barādī, *al-Jawāhir al-Muntaqāh*, Bārūnī Press, 1885, 162.

⁵ *Ibid*; Al-Qalhātī, *al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān*, vol II, 207.

- ⁶ Ibn Sallām, *al-Islam min Wajhat Naẓār al-Ibāḍiyyah*, 105 . Abū Qaḥṭān, *Sīrat Abī Qaḥṭān, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt* (ed. Kāshif, S. I.), vol. II, 95.
- ⁷ Al-Qalhātī, 207; Abū al-Ḥasan, al-Bisīanī, *Sīrat al-Su'āl, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt* (ed. Kāshif, S. I.), vol. II, 80.
- ⁸ Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *siyrat Abū al-Mu'athar, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 302.
- ⁹ Al-Ruḥayl Maḥbūb, *Sīrat Maḥbūb*. vol. II, 225; *Ibn Ibāḍ, Sīrat Abd Allāh*. vol. II, 331; al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 207.
- ¹⁰ *Idem*.
- ¹¹ Ibn Ibāḍ, op. cit., 333.
- ¹² Ibn Ibāḍ, vol. II, 331; Abu Qaḥṭān, *Sīrah*, 95; al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 207; al-Ṣalt, 303.
- ¹³ *Idem*.
- ¹⁴ *Idem*.
- ¹⁵ *Idem*.
- ¹⁶ Abū al-Mu'athir, *Sīrat al-Aḥdāth wa-al-Ṣifāt, al-Su'āl, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt* (ed. Kāshif, S. I.), vol. II, 97; al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 208.
- ¹⁷ Ibn Ibāḍ, op. cit., 332.
- ¹⁸ Umar use to give the people who participated in the Battle of Badr four thousand *dirham* from the *dīwān* but 'Uthmān reduced that by one thousand; see Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 213.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 331-2.
- ²⁰ Ibn Ibāḍ, vol. II, 331; al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 213.
- ²¹ *Idem*.
- ²² The Ibāḍīs did not give any detail for this accusation; on this matter see al-Ṭabarī, vol. IV, 243-4.
- ²³ Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 208.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*; Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *al-Aḥdāth wa-al-Ṣifāt*, vol. II, 97; Al-Barāḍī, *al-Jawāhir al-Muntaqāh*, Bārūnī Press, 1885, 163.
- ²⁵ *Idem*.
- ²⁶ Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī, whose name is Jundb b. Junadah, one of the early Muslims. He died in al-Rabadhah in 31 A.H. Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣābah fī Tamāz al-Ṣaḥabah*, vol. VII, 205-9, Lebanon, 1995.
- ²⁷ Al-Rabadhah is a small town near Medina in the direction of Mecca, and is a well-known archaeological site. Yāqut al-Ḥamwī, *Mu'jīm al-Buldān*, Lebanon, 1990, vol. III, 27.
- ²⁸ 'Ammār b. Yāsir fought with 'Alī at Ṣiffīn against Mu'āwiyah and was killed at Ṣiffīn in 37 A.H. His killing became evidence that 'Alī was right because of the *ḥadīth* which mention that He will be killed by a tyrant group, See Abū al-Ḥassan, *Sīrat al-Su'āl*, vol. II, 78. This *ḥadīth* is also narrated by al-Bukḥārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*.
- ²⁹ Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd, one of the early Muslims and a scholar among the Companions of the Prophet was appointed as governor by 'Umar and died in 32 A.H. Ibn Ḥajar, *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*, Damascus, 1992, 323.
- ³⁰ Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 208-10.
- ³¹ Ibn Ibāḍ, vol. II, 332.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 334.
- ³³ *Idem*.
- ³⁴ *Idem*.

- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 335.
- ³⁶ Al-Ṣalt, *al-Aḥdāth wa-al-Ṣifāt*, vol. I, 99; Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 97.
- ³⁷ Ibn Ibād, vol. II, 355; Abū Qaḥṭān, Khālīd, *Sirat Abū Qaḥṭān, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol I, 97; Al-Ṣalt, 97.
- ³⁸ *Idem.*
- ³⁹ *Idem.*
- ⁴⁰ *Idem.*
- ⁴¹ *Idem.*
- ⁴² If a person accused another, the burdenn of proof is on him according to Islamic law. He must bring two witnesses or accept oath of the accused.
- ⁴³ Al-Ṭabarī, vol. IV, 325; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. VII, 175; Ibn Shabbah, vol. III, 1151.
- ⁴⁴ Abū Bakr b. al-‘Arabī, *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim fī taḥqīq mawaqif al-ṣaḥabah ba‘d wafat al-nabī*, ed. M. al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, Cairo, 1968. 109
- ⁴⁵ Ibn Shabbah, vol. IV, 1225-6.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 1151-52; Abū Bakr b. al-‘Arabī, *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, 127-128.
- ⁴⁸ This is the Arabic words which show the messenger; way of approaching the rebels on his way to Egypt read, “فبينما هم بالطريق إذا هم براكب يتعرض لهم ثم يفارقهم ويسبقهم”
- ⁴⁹ Abū Qaḥṭān, Khālīd, *Sirat Abū Qaḥṭān*, 97.
- ⁵⁰ Ibn Ibād. vol. II, 340; Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 215.
- ⁵¹ Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 216.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, 217.
- ⁵³ “And the foremost to embrace Islam of the Muhājirūn and Anṣār and also those who followed them exactly. Allāh is well-pleased with them as they are well-pleased with Him. He has prepared for them Gardens under which rivers flow to dwell therein forever. That is the supreme success (Q:9:100).
- ⁵⁴ Al-‘Asqalānī, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, ed. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Bāz and Muḥammad Fu‘ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī, Beirut, 1997, vol. V, 324.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.* vol. VII, 17.
- ⁵⁶ Ibn Taymiyyah, *Sharḥ al-‘Aqīdah al-Waṣiṭiyyah*, Al-Riyad, 1995, 249-252.
- ⁵⁷ *Idem*
- ⁵⁸ Ibn Shabbah, *Ta’rīkh al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah*, ed. Fahīm, Muḥammad Shaltūt, Mecca, 1979 vol. III, 1264.
- ⁵⁹ *Idem.*
- ⁶⁰ It is reported that ‘Uthmān ordered Ibn ‘Abbas to lead the pilgrimage that year and ‘Uthmān that gave him a message to read to the pilgrims; Al-Ṭabarī, vol. V, 425-431.
- ⁶¹ Ibn Shabbah, vol. IV, 1279; The report of al-Ṭabarī, is slightly different in stating that when Ibn ‘Abbās arrived from the Ḥajj he found that ‘Uthmān had been killed, and that people were asking ‘Alī to accept the caliphate and he was refusing. So Ibn ‘Abbās asked him to accept but to bear in mind that he will be accused of ‘Uthmān’s killing; Al-Ṭabarī, vol. IV, 407.
- ⁶² *Idem.*

- ⁶³ This report is dismissed by Madelung [*The succession to Muḥammad*, Cambridge, 1997.133. without any evidence by saying “well attested to be doubtful”]
- ⁶⁴ *Al-‘Aqd al-Farīd*, vol. IV, 305; Ibn Shabbah, vol. IV, 1267.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 218.
- ⁶⁶ Abū al-Ḥassan, al-Bisiānī, *Sirat al-Su‘āl*, vol. II, 81; Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 225.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid*; Abū al-Mu‘thir, vol. II, 311; *Sirat al-Su‘āl fī al-Walāyah wa-al-Barā‘ah, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. I, 376.
- ⁶⁸ Abū al-Mu‘thir al-Ṣalt, vol. I, 48; Ibn al-Yamān, Haroon, *Risāl Haroon ila al-Imām al-Muḥannā b. Jīfar, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. I, 355.
- ⁶⁹ Al-Shammākhī, Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd, *al-Ṣiyar*, vol. I, ed. Aḥmad b. Sa‘ūd al-Siyyābī, Oman, 1992, 47; Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 235.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid*
- ⁷¹ Ibn ‘Aṭīyah Shabīb, *Sirat Shbīb, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 357.
- ⁷² *Idem.*
- ⁷³ *Idem.*
- ⁷⁴ Abū al-Mu‘athir al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *Sirat Abū al-Mu‘athir al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 314.
- ⁷⁵ The concept of Imamate al-shirā’ is based on the act of Abū Bilāl in revolting against Ibn Ziyād..
- ⁷⁶ Jamīl b. Khamīs, *Qāmūs al- Sharī‘ah*, Oman, 1983, vol. VII, 310.
- ⁷⁷ Abū al-Mu‘athir al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, vol. II, 314; Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 240.
- ⁷⁸ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 48.
- ⁷⁹ Abū Qaḥṭān, vol. I, 108.
- ⁸⁰ The Ibāḍīs maintain that this group is the best among the Muslims who continued the way of the Prophet.
- ⁸¹ Al-Mubarrad, Muḥammad b. Yazīd, *al-Kāmil fī al-Adab*, Cairo, n.d, vol. III, 234 ; Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 240; Al-Dīnāwarī, *al-Akḥbār al-Ṭiwāl*, 216; Al-Ṭabarī, vol. III, 113.
- ⁸² *Idem.*
- ⁸³ Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 244-50; Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, al-Kindī, *Bayan al-Shar‘*, Oman, 1988, vol. III, 350.
- ⁸⁴ *Idem.*
- ⁸⁵ *Idem.*
- ⁸⁶ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 49.
- ⁸⁷ Jamīl b. Khamīs, *Qāmūs al- Sharī‘ah*, vol. VII, 302-3; Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 237.
- ⁸⁸ *Idem.*
- ⁸⁹ He was one of Alī’s army who joined the Khārijites. This report is unlikely to be true because ‘Alī was quoting the *ḥadīth* after the Battle which show that he was right in fighting them. It would not be possible for ‘Alī to do that. Al-Ājūrī, Abū Bakr, *Kitāb al-Sharī‘ah*, ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Damayjī, Riyaḍ, 1997, 352-84.
- ⁹⁰ Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 252.
- ⁹¹ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 52.
- ⁹² *Idem.*
- ⁹³ Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 252.

- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 253.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid.*; Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *al-Bayān wa-al-Burhān, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 202.
- ⁹⁶ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 54.
- ⁹⁷ Ibn Ibāḍ, vol. II 355; Al-Barāḍī, *al-Jawāhir al-Muntaqāh*, 163 ; Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 54.
- ⁹⁸ Al-Ṣalt, *al-Aḥdāth wa-al-Ṣifāt*, 109; Abū Qaḥṭān, 108.
- ⁹⁹ Al-Qalhātī, vol. II, 225.
- ¹⁰⁰ Ibn Ibāḍ, vol. II, 336.
- ¹⁰¹ *Idem.*
- ¹⁰² *Al-Qalhātī*, vol. II, 256.
- ¹⁰³ Ibn Ibāḍ, vol. II, 340; Abū Qaḥṭān, vol I, 119-110.
- ¹⁰⁴ The Ibāḍīs call this kind of khurūj striving in the way of Allāh to forbid wrong and spread justice.
- ¹⁰⁵ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 65.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Idem.*
- ¹⁰⁷ Al-Darjīnī, vol. II, 215.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 216-7.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Idem.*
- ¹¹⁰ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 67.
- ¹¹¹ Al-Darjīnī, vol. II, 216.
- ¹¹² Haroon Ibn al-Yamān, *Risalah*, vol. I, 358.
- ¹¹³ Al-Jiṭālī, Abū Ṭāhir, *Qanāṭir al-khayrāt*, vol I, 65.
- ¹¹⁴ It is reported that these two men were relatives and that their revolt was rejected by Abū Bilāl on the grounds of his rejection of the need for investigation and the spreading of fear among Muslims. Al-Mubarrad, vol. III, 244-45.
- ¹¹⁵ Al-Kindī, Muhammad , Bayān al-Shar‘, vol. III, 217
- ¹¹⁶ It is reported that Abū Bilāl said: “It is hard to remain under an unjust system. It is also cruel to revolt, however, we will move out and we will not fight except those who fight us.” Al-Mubarrad, vol. III, 250.
- ¹¹⁷ Al-Kindī, Abū Bakr, *al-Jawhar al-Muqtaṣar*,. Kāshif, Oman, 1985, 137.
- ¹¹⁸ Ibn Ibāḍ, ‘Abd Allāh, *Sirat Ibn Ibāḍ, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 341.
- ¹¹⁹ Shabīb b. ‘Aṭṭīyah, *Sirat Shabīb, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 368.
- ¹²⁰ Ibn Ibāḍ, ‘Abd Allāh, *Sirat Ibn Ibāḍ, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 342.
- ¹²¹ Shabīb b. ‘Aṭṭīyah, *Sirat Shabīb, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 351.
- ¹²² Ibn Ibāḍ, ‘Abd Allāh, *Sirat Ibn Ibāḍ, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 342.
- ¹²³ Al-Kindī, M. vol III, 218; Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *Sirat al-Ṣalt, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 314.
- ¹²⁴ Al-Kindī, Abū Bakr, *al-Jawhar al-Muqtaṣar*, 124: *Abū al-Ḥasan, Sīrat Abū al-Ḥasan, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 125.
- ¹²⁵ Al-Qalhātī, *al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān*, vol. II, 429-30.
- ¹²⁶ Ibn Ibāḍ, ‘Abd Allāh, *Sirat Ibn Ibāḍ, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 342.

- ¹²⁷ Al-Rabī' related to Jabīr b. Zayd to Abū Sa'īd al-Khudarī. This *ḥadīth* is also narrated by al-Bukharī, Muslim, and Mālik.
- ¹²⁸ Al-Sālimī, *Sharḥ al-Jāmi'*, vol. I, 59.
- ¹²⁹ Abū al-Ḥasan, *Sīrat al-Su'āl, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 85; Al-Kindī, M., vol. III, 218.
- ¹³⁰ Al-Sālimī, *Sharḥ al-Jāmi'*, vol. I, 59.
- ¹³¹ Ibn Ibāḍ, 'Abd Allāh, *Sīrat Ibn Ibāḍ, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 353.
- ¹³² Al-Fikr al-Siyasī, 'Addun Jahlān, 95.
- ¹³³ Shabīb b. 'Aṭṭīyyah, *Sīrat Shabīb, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 375.
- ¹³⁴ Alī, Yaḥyā, *al-Ibāḍīyyah fī Mawḳib al-Ta'rīkh*, 34.
- ¹³⁵ Shabīb b. 'Aṭṭīyyah, *Sīrat Shabīb, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 368-9; al-Siyābī, Sālim, *Aṣḍaq al-manāḥij fī tamyīz al-Ibāḍīyyah min al-Khwārij*, 32.
- ¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 35.
- ¹³⁷ Al-Ṭabarī, vol. III, 398.
- ¹³⁸ Ibn Ibāḍ, 'Abd Allāh, *Sīrat Ibn Ibāḍ, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 242.
- ¹³⁹ Shabīb b. 'Aṭṭīyyah, *Sīrat Shabīb, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 368-9.
- ¹⁴⁰ Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *Sīrat al-Ṣalt, al-Siyar wa-al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 308.
- ¹⁴¹ Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kindī, d. 557 A.H.
- ¹⁴² Al-Wahbiyya were named after 'Abd Allāh Wahb al-Rāsibī. He was the first Imam to be appointed by the Khārījites after they had moved from 'Alī's army. They also call themselves al-Ibāḍīyyah, *ahl-al-Istiḳāmah*, *ahl-al-Da'wah* and *Jamā'at al-Muslimīn* and *al-Muḥakimah*. They asserted that they were on the right path of following the Book of Allāh and the *Sunnah* of the Prophet and consensus (Ijmā') of the Muslims. Al-Qalḥātī, *al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān*, vol. II, 421; Abū Bakr Aḥmad bin 'Abd Allāh al-Kindī, *al-Jawhar al-Muqtaṣar*, Oman, 1985, 138-139.
- ¹⁴³ Al-Qalḥātī, vol. II, 421-35.
- ¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 430.
- ¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 431.
- ¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 432.
- ¹⁴⁷ It is reported this group consider that whoever has committed a grave sin punished with ḥadd is a kāfir after the punishment. Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī, *al-Faṣl fī al-Milal wal-Ahwā' wa al-Niḥal*, vol. I, Beirut, 1996, 126.
- ¹⁴⁸ Al-Qalḥātī, vol. II, 341; Al-Shahrastānī, Abū al-Faṭḥ, *al-Milal wa-al-Niḥal*, Beirut, 1996, vol. I, 144-46.
- ¹⁴⁹ Al-Qalḥātī, vol. II, 342.
- ¹⁵⁰ It was reported that they rejected Surat Yusuf because a love story cannot be reported in the Qur'ān. Al-Shahrastānī, vol. I, 148.
- ¹⁵¹ Al-Qalḥātī, vol. II, 433.
- ¹⁵² They were called by Al-Shahrastānī Aṣfariyyah al-Ziyādiyyah. *al-Milal wa-al-Niḥal*, vol. I, 159.
- ¹⁵³ Al-Qalḥātī, vol. II, 433; Al-Shahrastānī, vol. I, 149.
- ¹⁵⁴ *Idem.*
- ¹⁵⁵ Al-Qalḥātī, vol. II, 434.

¹⁵⁶ *Idem.*

¹⁵⁷ *Idem.*

¹⁵⁸ *Idem.*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 435.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ROLE OF JĀBIR B. ZAYD

Both early and more recent Ibādī scholars agree that Jābir b. Zayd is the person who established Ibādīyyah. Jābir was born in Farq, a small town near Nizwa¹ in Oman. He then migrated to Baṣrah in Iraq and stayed there for the remainder of his life. It is not known when exactly he moved to Baṣrah,² nor is there any agreement on his dates of birth and death. However, all the sources show that he was born somewhere between 18 and 22 A.H. and he died between 93 and 96 A.H. According to Abū ‘Ubaydah, Jābir b. Zayd died in the same year as Anas b. Mālīk, the great Companion of the Prophet, in 93 A.H. This is probably correct as Abū ‘Ubaydah was a student of Jābir.³

Jābir is counted as an important Successor to the Companions in both Sunnī and Ibādī sources. He is described as a trustworthy and knowledgeable person.⁴ He was one of the students of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās, the great Companion of the Prophet. The Ibādīs have narrated many statements showing the depth of Jābir’s knowledge, some of which are given below:

Jābir said: “I have managed to meet seventy of the Companions who participated in the Battle of Badr and learnt from them”. By this they demonstrated that Jābir had learnt from many Companions of the Prophet.

It has also been narrated by the Ibādīs that Ibn ‘Abbās said: “ Why should the people of Iraq come to us to ask us when they have Jābir b. Zayd among them”. This is an indication of how knowledgeable Jābir was regarded.⁵

It has also been narrated by the Ibādīs that Ibn ‘Abbās said: “ If the people of Baṣrah followed what Jābir is telling them that would be sufficient for them as an interpreter of the Book of Allāh”.⁶ This shows their understanding that Jābir had the knowledge to interpret the Qur’ān confirmed by Ibn ‘Abbās who was regarded as one of the most learned interpreters of the Qur’ān.

It has been reported that Qatādah said on the death of Jābir: "Today the most knowledgeable person in Iraq has died."⁷

It is reported that Jābir was a friend of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣri, one of the famous scholars of Islam and the *muftī* of Baṣrah. Jābir used to give *fatwas* in his absence.⁸ Iyās b. Mu‘āwiyah reported: “ I entered Baṣrah and did not see any *mufti* other than Jābir b. Zayd.”⁹

It has also been reported by the Ibādīs that Jābir and Abū Bilāl visited ‘Ā’isha, the wife of the Prophet, and asked her to repent from what happened in the Battle of the Camel. She asked Allāh to forgive her for what she had done. Jābir used the opportunity to ask her questions on the marital life of the Prophet.¹⁰

The Ibādīs emphasise that Jābir b. Zayd was an Ibādī. A recent Ibādī scholar, Bakūsh, said: “ I used to believe when I was young that Imam Jābir b. Zayd was a scholar of the Ibādīs only. Later I realised that he was counted as one of the scholars

of the whole Muslim *ummah*. And all the Muslims knew him as trustworthy, even those belonging to different schools of thought. His opinions were narrated and his sayings were reported by scholars together with opinions and sayings of the great scholars of Islam and they were put in a high rank.¹¹ Jābir is reported to have lived a humble life. He used to say: “ I have asked Allāh to give me a pious wife, a good horse and *ḥalal* sustenance day by day.” He also used to say to his students: “None of you is richer than me. I do not have a *dirham* but yet it is sufficient”.¹²

It is unknown when exactly the relationship between Jābir and the Ibādīs started. The Ibādī sources cite many reports of Jābir being their founder. Among the reports which established him as an Ibādī and show that Jābir was in close relations with the Ibādīs are the following:

Two of the Ibādīs were talking together in the presence of Jābir without noticing him. They mentioned a man and said, “May Allāh curse him.” So Jābir said, “May the curse of Allāh be on the one you have cursed.” The two men said: “We didn’t know you were here.” Then they asked: “How can you curse somebody without knowing him?” He replied: “And what do I need as evidence other than the two of you?” The Ibādī view is that the evidence of two Ibādīs in itself is enough to establish the doctrine of dissociation (*barā’ah*).¹³

In another incident, Abū Sufyān Maḥbūb b. al-Ruḥayl, said that a youth came to Abū Sha‘thā,¹⁴ (Jābir) and asked him: “Which jihād is the best?” He replied;

“Killing Khardalah” The young man did not know who Khardalah was. So Jābir went with him and pointed out Khardalah in the mosque. The youth stabbed him in the chest and killed him. Khardalah had been one of the Ibāḍīs but then he left them and started giving information about them.¹⁵

This would indicate that Jābir was allowing the assassination of people who were against the group and disclosing their secrets. The opinion of the Ibāḍīs is that if a person does not want to continue with them, he is allowed to do so and they will not hurt him in any way as long as he does not rebel against them, disclose their secrets or talk wrongly about their faith. However, if he does these things, then killing him is permitted.

In another incident, an old man named Abū Sufyān was seized by the governor ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād in order to question him about members of the Ibāḍī movement. When the man refused, Ibn Ziyād ordered him to be whipped until he gave information but the old man did not say a word. When Jābir saw this he said: “I was very near to him and was worried that the man would point towards me but Allāh saved him from talking.”¹⁶ However, the Ibāḍī sources show that there was a close friendship between Jābir and Abū Bilāl. From a very early age Abū Bilāl is regarded as an early member of the Ibāḍī movement. This was, according to these sources, a two-way relationship. It is suggested that Jābir was influenced by the ideas of Abū Bilāl and became a member of the movement which was later to be

called the Ibādī movement. However, the same sources emphasise that Abū Bilāl did not do anything without first consulting Jābir.¹⁷ Jābir and Abū Bilāl and other members of the movement kept Jābir's membership of the movement secret in order to protect him from the government so that they would not lose their real leader and the brains of the movement.¹⁸ Thus, even at the time of Abū Bilāl, it is suggested that Jābir was closely involved in the leadership of the movement. While Abū Bilāl represented the more active and aggressive aspect of the movement, Jābir represented the underground aspect.¹⁹

He seems to have established reasonably good relations with the Umayyad rulers and to have done nothing in public to undermine that relationship.²⁰ It is reported that he used to pray behind Ziyād when the latter was persecuting the early members of the movement in Baṣrah and also behind his son, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād, who was responsible for the death of Abū Bilāl. He was a close friend of Yazīd b. Abī Muslim, who was the personal secretary of al-Ḥajjāj. His relationship with al-Ḥajjāj also seems to have been good and he prayed behind him even though al-Ḥajjāj was responsible for the imprisonment of two of Jābir's student and followers, Abū 'Ubaydah and Ja'far b. al-Sammāk.²¹ In fact, it is reported that al-Ḥajjāj offered him the post of *qaḍī* of Baṣrah but he refused this. However, he did receive funds from the treasury. He also seems to have had good relations with the family of al-Muhallab, who was responsible for the defeat of the supporters of Ibn al-Azraq.²² However, in the general condemnation of Ibn al-Azraq, it would appear that Jābir

and the followers of the Ibādī movement approved of the the action of al-Muhallab.²³ In fact, the fact that several of Jābir's letters were written to members of al-Muhallab's family, one is to Khayrah bint Ḍamrah, the wife of al-Muhallab, and two to al-Muhallab's son, 'Abd al-Mālik. All the letters were about legal problems and this suggests that Jābir may have acted as a legal adviser to the family.

There is no real record of Jābir having undergone any harassment from the authorities. However, there is one late report that Jābir was exiled to Oman and that that was one of the reasons for the spread of the Ibādī movement in Oman.²⁴ The report is unlikely to be accurate as it runs in stark contrast to all the other reports of Jābir's career. On the other hand, it is very possible that during his life, Jābir did visit Oman, the place of his birth. Such a visit or visits could well have helped in the spread of the Ibādī movement in Oman

It is reported that Jābir made the pilgrimage forty times. This report is intended to emphasise Jābir's piety. However, without undermining the pious intention of Jābir in making the pilgrimage, those occasions were also used by secret persecuted groups to hold meetings with distant members and to spread their message. Doubtless Jābir also used that time for such purposes.²⁵

In the eighteen letters of Jābir provided to me by the Ministry of National Heritage and Culture, there are only four quotations from the Qur'ān and no *ḥadīths*. There are two references to the Sunnah of the Prophet. However, Jābir has quotes from Ibn

‘Abbās on seven occasions, from ‘Alī once, ‘Umar once and ‘Ikrimah twice. There is no attack on ‘Uthmān, ‘Ali or Mu‘āwiyah. Despite the seemingly ordinary nature of his correspondence, on four occasions Jābir warns the recipients to keep this correspondence secret. It would seem that even in his correspondence, Jābir was careful to keep his association with the Ibādī movement secret.²⁶

It should be pointed out that the contents of these letters from Jābir consist entirely of fatwās in answer to questions of law. Therefore, one would expect Jābir merely to give his legal decision to the questioners without giving them the Qur’ānic quotation and *ḥadīths* on which he had based them. The letters are short and provide brief answers to legal problems. They are not a text book on Islamic law or an attempt to persuade an opponent of the correct views of a problem.

It is claimed that Jābir wrote a large work of law called *Diwān* in which one would expect to find quotations from the Qur’ān and the *ḥadīths*. Unfortunately, this book does not seem to have survived. However, a work has been compiled using Sunnī and Ibādī sources which gives Jābir’s legal doctrines. This is replete with Qur’ānic quotations and *ḥadīths*.²⁷

Among the important students of Jābir were Ḍumān b. al-Sā’ib, Ja’far b. Sammāk, Ṣuhār al-‘Abdī and most significant of all, Abū ‘Ubaydah.

Jābir b. Zayd is a very important figure for the Ibādīs. While the movement regards itself as a continuation of “the sincere Muslims” who resisted ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah, they also regard Jābir as their founder in terms of being a distinct group. The importance of Jābir for the movement’s religious development is paramount. He provided the link to the Sunnah of the Prophet so that the Ibādīs could have a proper legal system.

-
- ¹ Nizwa is the capital of the Interior of Oman. Historically it is regarded as the centre of Ibādī scholarship. It is about 120 km from Muscat, the capital of Oman
- ² Khalayfat, Awaḍ, Nash at al-Harakah al-Ibādīyyah, Amman, 1978, 86.
- ³ Al-Ḥārithī, Salim, al Uqud al-Fiḍīyyah fi Uṣūl al-Ibādīyyah, Oman, n.d, 94.
- ⁴ Al-Battashī, 42.
- ⁵ Al-Darjīnī, vol. I, 205; al-Shammākhī, vol I, 67.
- ⁶ Idem.
- ⁷ Idem.
- ⁸ Al-Darjīnī, vol. I, 213 - 214.
- ⁹ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 68.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 79.
- ¹¹ Bakūsh, Yahyā, *Fiqh al-Imām Jābir b. Zayd*, Lebanon, 1986, 7.
- ¹² Al-Darjīnī, vol. I, 206.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 213; al-Ṣawwāfī, Ṣaliḥ, *al-Imām Jābir*, Oman, 95.
- ¹⁴ Al-Sha‘tha was the daughter of Jābir. She died in Farq in Oman and her grave is still known there. Bakūsh, 11.
- ¹⁵ Al-Ḥārithī, 101 - 102.
- ¹⁶ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 79; al-Jīṭālī, vol. I, 77-8.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*; Al-Ṣawwāfī, 151-2; Al-Ḥārithī, 107.

¹⁸ *Idem.*

¹⁹ Khalayfat, 95.

²⁰ Al-Ṣawwāfī, 150.

²¹ Al-Dirjīnī, vol. I, 211; al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 70; al-Jiṭālī, Qawā'id al-Islam 77.

²² *Rasā'il Jābir*, 17-18.

²³ Ibn Ibādī, vol. II, 334, al-Barāḍī, 165.

²⁴ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 71.

²⁵ *Idem.*

²⁶ See *Rasā'il Jābir*, 1-18.

²⁷ All the Ibādī sources mention this diwān but it is not extant..

CHAPTER THREE

AN EDITION OF THE ARABIC TEXT OF IBN IBĀD'S

LETTER TO 'ABD AL-MALIK

The following is an edition of the text of Ibn Ibād's letter to 'Abd al-Malik. The major text relied upon is that given in *al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, pp. 325-355. The text has been amended and added to according to the of the letter given by al-Barrādī in *al-Jawāhir al-Muntaqāh* pp.156-167. According to the text given by Sālim b. Ḥamūd al-Ḥārithī in *al-Uqūd al-Fiddiyyah fī Uṣūl al-Ibādīyyah*, pp. 123-138.

Ibādī sources mention that 'Abd Allāh b. Ibād of the tribe of Tamīm was the Imam of the scholars specialising in the revision of *ḥadīth* and a key figure in the controversy among the scholars who dealt with the delineating of the sects and with the criteria separating the ways of error and ignorance.¹ This letter was contemporaneous with the political events that it gives account of and is a record of the various historical positions taken by the Ibādīs.

The Ibādī sources are unanimous that 'Abd Allāh b. Ibād was deserted by the errant groups as well as the extremist Khārijites and that he was the spokesman for the Ibādīs during this period, which led 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān to invite him to write

to him. The probable reason for this was that ‘Abd al-Malik, who was known for his shrewdness, wished to gain sway over the moderate Khārijites and co-operate with them in repudiating the extremist Khārijites, who considered all other Muslims to be unbelievers.

The reply of ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ clarified the position of the Ibāḍīs in relation to the Izragites and other extremist Khārijites, and sought to make plain their views and beliefs so that they would not be considered to be amongst the renegades who were to be fought and exterminated.

Whether Ibn Ibāḍ himself wrote this letter, and in particular whether this letter dealt with all the relevant political issues of that time, may be legitimately questioned. What cannot be disputed is Ibn Ibāḍ’s open defence of the views of the Ibāḍīs during his split from the Khārijites in the year 64 A.H, and that he took part, along with the leaders of the Khārijites, in the talks with ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr that took place subsequent to his rebellion against the Umayyads. It is very possible, as we have said, that ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān wrote to him because he was the official spokesman for the Ibāḍīs. This letter also contains a consolidation of Ibāḍī ideology and articles of belief upon which the historical position of the Ibāḍīs was based and which are still upheld to this day. Al-Shammākhī² said, “Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ obtained his views from Jābir b. Zayd and he was well known among the people of Baṣrah as a defender of Ibāḍī” and concluded that this might have been a reason for ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān to having written to him.³

In addition, there is further evidence showing that ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ was the author of this letter:

1. The language, expressions and phraseology used in the letter are archaic and of the type used in the Umayyad era; this is evident in particular in the prologue and the epilogue, and from the linguistic components that he used in general.
2. Ibāḍī sources, be they from Oman or from North Africa, despite the existence of slight differences in wording, are in essence in accord, and the issues which are discussed therein are the same, i.e. the historical position of the Ibāḍīs during the first era of Islam.⁴
3. The source of the power of the letter is in the many Qur’ānic quotations, more than seventy in number, and also in the use of Qur’ānic expressions, which occur on ten other occasions. This goes to support the view that this letter was written in the first century of Islam when the Khārijites were the reciters of the Qur’ān who frequently quoted the Qur’ān in support of their political stances and in interpretation of various events where the Qur’ānic text was brought to bear on them. This letter

does not contain a single prophetic *ḥadith* but mentions the sunnah of the Prophet.

4. The events mentioned in the letter were in the past or contemporaneous with its author, which indicates that it was written during the lifetime of ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ; his upbringing was during the time of Mu‘āwiyah and he died during the years of the Caliphate of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān.

Cook has opined that this letter is not by ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ and that it was sent by Jābir b. Zayd to ‘Abd al-Malik b. al-Muhallab. The letters of Jābir b. Zayd are 18 in number⁵, two of which were sent to ‘Abd al-Malik b. al-Muhallab, but this letter was not amongst them.⁶ The letters sent by Jābir were concerned with questions of jurisprudence. Therefore, the basis of Cook’s argument is questionable, particularly due to the fact that he relies in his discussion upon the book *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ*, a doubtful source owing to its being of uncertain authorship. There are two books entitled ‘*Kashf al-Ghummaḥ*’: The first is a collection of stories and historical accounts, set in Oman, by Abū Sulaymān Muḥammad b. Rāshid al-Ma’walī and the events described therein end in the year 1159 A.H.⁷ The other book is a history of Oman by an anonymous author; the events it describes end in 1215 A.H. and it is attributed to Sarḥān b. Sa‘īd al-Azkawī who is unknown since he is not mentioned in any of the historical books of Oman.

Cook claims that there are two letters from Ibn Ibāḍ to ‘Abd al-Malik. However, his source for these is the very late *Kashf al-Ghummah*, allegedly written by Sirhān b. Sa‘īd al-Azkawī.⁸ Cook has convincingly demonstrated that the first letter is a forgery. However, his attempt to argue that the same applies to the second letter, which is probably the one and only letter, is undermined by the fact that what he is analysing is actually a very corrupt and interpolated version of that letter.⁹

In *al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābat*¹⁰ only one letter is given and it does not contain the passage attacking the Shī‘ah which Cook discusses so fully.¹¹ It is very direct, its contents being concerned with pointing out to ‘Abd al-Malik the reasons why ‘Uthmān had to be killed and the justification of the Ibāḍī political and religious stance. It is in essence a complete defence of the Ibāḍī movement and covers most of the ground of the early period of Islam, to which other Ibāḍī writers tend to pay less attention. The fact that the Ibāḍīs adopted a quiescent policy may have been the reason for ‘Abd al-Malik’s having written to Ibn Ibāḍ in the first place, and also for the quality of Ibn Ibāḍ’s response.

‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ well known among Ibāḍī groups. It is stipulated that his general and particular judicial rulings are followed, and he is the axis and centre of the Ibāḍī School, the basis of its principles and its guiding light.¹²

In addition, the names found in the letter of Ibn Ibāḍ are also mentioned in non-Ibāḍī sources. These sources confirm that these individuals were amongst those who rebelled against ‘Uthmān and his agents, and Ibn Ibāḍ praises them and describes them as being warriors against oppression. Again, this indicates that the letter was of this period. Finally, this letter forms the whole basis of Ibāḍī thought, and the historical books of Oman confirm what is contained in this letter regarding the stances taken towards the political events of the early Islamic era.

Among the negative points with regard to the authorship this letter is the fact that there is no decisive chain of narrators for it that leads back to ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ as is found in the books of *ḥadīth* and other historical texts. The letter also mentions various accusations directed at ‘Uthmān that are not to be found in other chronicles. These include:

1. The accusation that ‘Uthmān prevented the people of Oman and Baṣrah from selling their food before the food of the principality.
2. That ‘Uthmān prevented ruling in the mosque by the book of Allah.
3. Certain names mentioned therein are not to be found in other authoritative historical sources.

Despite these points against the letter, it would still seem that ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Ibāḍ was the spokesman for the Ibāḍī movement. It was as a result of the high profile

given to Ibn Ibāḍ that the movement acquired its name. Thus, it seems more than possible that ‘Abd al-Malik would have written to a public figure who was associated with a quiescent group of moderate Khārijites in order to seek his co-operation.

That Ibn Ibāḍ did give his name to the movement may explain the confusion in Ibāḍī sources regarding his status, i.e. whether he was an Imam or merely the public spokesman for Jābir b. Zayd. If he was, in fact, the spokesman for the Ibāḍīs, he would naturally have taken a higher profile than would Jābir, who emphasised the need for secrecy (*kitmān*) and precautionary dissimulation (*taqiyyah*).¹³ This would also explain why ‘Abd al-Malik wrote to him and the fact of his reply.

¹ Al-Darjīnī, vol. II, 214.

² Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd al-Shammākhī (d. 928 A.H).

³ Al-Shammākhī, Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd, *al-Ṣiyar*, ed. Aḥmad b. Sa‘ūd al-Siyābī, Oman, 1992, vol. I, 73.

⁴ *al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 325-355; Sirḥān b. Sa‘īd al-Azkawī, *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ*, 232-240; Al-Barrādī in *al-Jawāhir al-Muntaqāh*, 156-167; Sālim b. Ḥamūd al-Ḥārithī in *al-Uqūd al-Fiddiyyah fī Uṣūl al-Ibāḍiyyah*, 123-138.

⁵ *Rasā’il Jābir*, 1-18

⁶ *Ibid.*, 17-18

⁷ *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ*, ed. ‘Abd al-Majīd Ḥasīb al-Qaysī, Oman, n.d., 4-5.

⁸ *Idem.*

⁹ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 51 - 67.

¹⁰ *Al-Siyar wa-al-Jawābāt li-‘Ulamā’ wa-A’immat ‘Umān*, ed. Sayyidah Ismā‘īl Kāshif, Oman, vol. II, 1986.

¹¹ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 54.

¹² Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 72.

¹³ The original theory of the Khawārij was against *taqiyya*, inwardly. The Azāriqah rejected *taqiyyah* in both word and deed. Salem, Elie Adib, *The Political Theory and Institutions of the Khawārij*, Baltimore, 1956, 98.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

سيرة عبد الله بن أباض إلى عبد الملك بن مروان:¹

1 من عبد الله بن أباض إلى عبد الملك بن مروان: سلام عليك، فإني أحمد إليك الله الذي لا إله إلا هو وأوصيك بتقوى الله فإن العاقبة للتقوى والمرد إلى الله واعلم، إنما يتقبل الله من المتقين.

2 أما بعد جاءني كتابك مع سنان بن عاصم، وإنك كتبت إلي أن أكتب إليك بكتاب، فكتبت به إليك فمنه ما تعرف ومنه ما تنكر. زعمت أنما عرفت منه ما ذكرت به من كتاب الله وحضضت عليه من طاعة الله واتباع أمره وسنة نبيه، وأما الذي أنكرت منه فهو عند الله غير منكر. وأما ما ذكرت من عثمان² والذي عرضت به من شأن الأئمة فإن³ الله ليس ينكر عليه أحد شهادته في كتابه بما أنزله على رسوله أنه من لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فأولئك هم الكافرون والظالمون والفساقون.⁴

3 وإني لم أكن أذكر لك شيئاً من شأن عثمان إلا والله يعلمه أنه الحق، وسأنزع لك من ذلك البينة من كتاب الله الذي أنزله على رسوله، وسأكتب إليك في الذي كتبت به وأخبرك من خير عثمان والذي طعنا عليه فيه وأبين شأنه والذي أتى عثمان. لقد كان كما ذكرت من قدم في الإسلام

¹ الخليفة الأموي تولى الحكم في عام 86 وتوفي عام 86 سير أعلام النبلاء شمس الدين الذهبي ج4 ص246-249.

² عثمان بن عفان الأموي القرشي يجتمع هو والرسول في عبد مناف اسلم أول الإسلام تولى الخلافة في 24 وقتل 35 اسد الغابة ج3 ص480-

492

³ في الكتاب "وان" فصحح إلى "فان" من الجواهر المنتقاة للبرادي ص 156 ، والعقود الفضية سالم الحارثي ص12 3

وعمل به ولكن الله لم يجز العباد من الفتنة والردة عن الإسلام،

4 وإن الله بعث محمداً بالحق وانزل الكتاب فيه بينات كل شيء يحكم بين الناس فيما اختلفوا فيه (هدى ورحمة لقوم يؤمنون).⁵ فأحل الله في كتابه حلالاً وحرم حراماً وفرض فيه حكماً وفصل فيه قضاءه⁶ وبين حدوده فقال (تلك حدود الله فلا تقربوها).⁷ وقال (ومن يتعد حدود الله فألئك هم الظالمون).⁸

5 وقسم ربنا قسماً وليس في لعباده فيه الخيرة، ثم أمر نبيه باتباع كتابه فقال للنبي: (واتبع ما يوحى إليك من ربك).⁹ وقال (إذا قرأناه فاتبع قرآن).¹⁰ فعمل محمد بأمر ربه ومعه عثمان ومن شاء الله من أصحابه لا يرون رسول الله يتعدى من قبله شيئاً ولا يبدل فريضة ولا يستحل شيئاً حرمه الله ولا يحرم شيئاً أحله الله ولا يحكم بين الناس إلا بما أنزل الله فكان يقول (إني أخاف إن عصيت ربي عذاب يوم عظيم).¹¹ فعمر صلى الله عليه وسلم ما شاء الله تابِعاً لما أمر الله، يتبع ما جاء من الله والمؤمنون معه يعلمهم وينظرون إلى عمله حتى توفاه الله عليه الصلاة والسلام وهم عنه راضون، فنسأل الله سبيله وعملاً بسنته. ثم أورث الله عباده الكتاب الذي جاء به محمد وهداه ولا يهتدي من

⁴ اشارة إلى الآيات 44 و45 و47 من سورة المائدة.

⁵ سورة الأعراف: آية 52

⁶ الكلمة غير واضحة في الكتاب فصحت من الجواهر المنتقاة للرازي ص 157 والعقود الفضية سالم الحارثي ص 124

⁷ سورة البقرة: آية 187

⁸ سورة البقرة: آية 229

⁹ سورة الأحزاب: آية 2

¹⁰ سورة القيامة: آية 18

¹¹ سورة الأنعام: آية 15

اهتدى من الناس إلا باتباعه ولا يضل من ضل إلا بتركه.

6 ثم قام من بعده أبو بكر¹² على الناس فأخذ بكتاب الله وسنة نبيه ولم يفارقه أحد من المسلمين في حكم حكمه ولا قسم قسمه حتى فارق الدنيا وأهل الإسلام عنه راضون وله بمجامعون.

ثم قام من بعده عمر بن الخطاب¹³ قوياً في الأمر شديداً على أهل النفاق، يهتدي بمن كان قبله من المؤمنين بحكم كتاب الله، وابتلاه الله بفتوح من الدنيا ما لم يتل به صاحبه، وفارق الدنيا والدين ظاهر وكلمة الإسلام جامعة وشهادتهم قائمة، والمؤمنون شهداء الله في الأرض وكذلك قال الله (جعلناكم أمة وسطاً لتكونوا شهداء على الناس ويكون الرسول عليكم شهيداً).¹⁴

7 ثم أشار المؤمنون فولوا عثمان فعمل ما شاء الله بما يعرف أهل الإسلام حتى بسطت له الدنيا وفتح له من خزائن الأرض ما شاء الله، ثم أحدث أموراً لم يعمل بها¹⁵ صاحبه قبله وعهد الناس يومئذ قريب بنبيهم فلما رأى المؤمنون ما أحدث أتوه فكلموه وذكروه بكتاب الله وسنة من كان من المؤمنين، وقال الله (ومن أظلم ممن ذكر بآيات الله ثم

¹² أبو بكر الصديق وهو عبدالله بن عثمان بن عامر بن كعب أول من أسلم من الرجال أول خليفة للمسلمين بعد النبي الذي حارب المرتدين في السنة الأولى من خلافته وقضى على حركة الردة. القلهاقي ج2 ص195-197

¹³ وهو عمر بن الخطاب بن نفيل بن عبد العزى ويجمع نسبه مع الرسول عليه السلام في الجد السابع في السنة الخامسة للدعوة الإسلامية. وتولى الخلافة بعد أبي بكر الصديق ابن الأثير أسد الغابة في معرفة الصحابة ج4 ص53

¹⁴ سورة البقرة: آية 143

¹⁵ وردت في الكتاب "به" الصواب "ها" فصحت من الجواهر المنتقاة للبرادي ص 158.

أعرض عنها إنا من المجرمين منتقمون).¹⁶ فسفه أن ذكره بآيات الله أخذهم بالجبروت وضرب منهم من شاء الله وسجن ونفاهم في أطراف الأرض من شاء الله منهم نفيًا أن ذكره بكتاب الله وسنة نبيه ومن كان قبله من المؤمنين وقال الله: (ومن أظلم ممن ذكر بآيات الله فأعرض عنها ونسي ما قدمت يداه).¹⁷

8 وإني أبين لك يا عبد الملك الذي أنكر المؤمنون على عثمان وفارقناه عليه فيما استحل من المعاصي عسى أن تكون جاهلاً عنه غافلاً وأنت على دينه وهو!! فإن عثمان لا يغني عنك من الله شيئاً فالله الله يا عبد الملك بن مروان قبل التناوش¹⁸ من مكان بعيد وقبل أن يكون لازماً وأجل مسمى!! وإنه كان مما طعن عليه المؤمنون وفارقوه وفارقناه فيه، فإن الله قال (ومن أظلم ممن منع مساجد الله أن يذكر فيها اسمه وسعى في خرابها أولئك ما كان لهم أن يدخلوها إلا خائفين لهم في الدنيا خزي ولهم في الآخرة عذاب عظيم).¹⁹ فكان عثمان أول من منع مساجد الله أن يقضى فيها بكتاب الله.

9 ومما نقمناه عليه وفارقناه عليه أن الله قال لمحمد (ولا تطرد الذين يدعون ربهم بالغداة والعشي).²⁰ كان أول هذه الأمة طردهم ونفاهم، فكان ممن نفاهم من أهل المدينة أبو ذر

¹⁶ سورة السجدة: آية 22

¹⁷ سورة الكهف: آية 57.

¹⁸ التناوش: التناول للشيء من مكان بعيد ورد هذا في القرآن الكريم "وأن لهم التناوش من مكان بعيد" ابن منظور لسان العرب ج14 ص6.

¹⁹ سورة البقرة: آية 114

²⁰ سورة الأنعام: آية 52

الغفاري،²¹ ومسلم الجهني²²، ونافع بن حطام²³، ونفى من أهل الكوفة كعب بن أبي الحلمة، وأبي الرحل الوجاج، وجندب بن زهير،²⁴ وجندب هو الذي قتل الساحر الذي كان يلعب به الوليد بن عقبة²⁵، ونفى عمرو بن زرارة، وزيد بن صبحان،²⁶ وأسود بن ذريح،²⁷ ويزيد بن قيس الهمداني،²⁸ وكردوس بن الحضرمي، في ناس كثير من أهل الكوفة. ونفى من أهل البصرة عامر بن عبدالله القسري، ومذعور العبدي²⁹، ولا أستطيع لك عددهم من المؤمنين.

10 ومما نقمناه عليه أنه أمر أخاه الوليد بن عقبة على المؤمنين،³⁰ وكان يلعب بالسحر ويصلي بالناس سكران، فاسق في دين الله أمره من أجل قرابته على المؤمنين المهاجرين والأنصار وإنما عهدهم حديث بعهد الله ورسوله والمؤمنين.

11 ومما نقمناه عليه إمارته قرابته على عباد الله وجعل المال دولة بين الأغنياء، وقال

²¹ اسمه جندب بن جنادة قال عنه الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم: ما أظلت الخضراء ولا أقلت الغبراء من ذي لهجه اصدق من أبي ذر، ابن حجر العسقلاني، تهذيب التهذيب ج 6 ص 335.

²² اسم لا توج له ترجمة في كتب التراجم الاباضية او السنية

²³ اسم لا توج له ترجمة في كتب التراجم الاباضية او السنية

²⁴ جندب الخير الازدي: ابو عبدالله، قاتل الساحر، مختلف في صحبته، يقال ابن كعب ويقال ابن زهير، قتل بصفين. ابن حجر العسقلاني، تقريب التهذيب ص 124.

²⁵ الوليد بن عقبة بن أبي معيط اسلم يوم الفتح وهو أخو عثمان لأمه أروى بنت كريز. وأمها البيضاء بنت عبد المطلب ابن حجر العسقلاني، الاصابه في تمييز الصحابه ج 6 ص 481-3.

²⁶ ذكر الطبري ان زيد بن صوحان قدم إلى المدينة في جمع من أهل الكوفة وهو ممن اشترك في حصار عثمان الطبري ج 4 ص 349-351.

²⁷ ذكر البرادي أن اسمه اسود بن دويج ص 159.

²⁸ يزيد بن قيس هو أحد الذين قدموا المدينة عام 34 لخلع عثمان انظر الطبري ج 4 ص 331.

²⁹ اسمان ليس لهما ترجمة في كتب التراجم الاباضية أو السنية

³⁰ اشاره إلى تعيين الوليد أمير على الكوفة ثم عزله ابن حجر العسقلاني، الاصابه في تمييز الصحابه ج 6 ص 482

الله (كي لا يكون دولة بين الأغنياء منكم).³¹ وبدل كلام الله وبدل القول واتبع الهوى.

12 ومما نقمناه عليه أنه انطلق إلى الأرض ليحميها لنفسه ولأهله حمى³² حتى منع قطر السماء والرزق الذي أنزله الله لعباده، لأنفسهم ولإنعامهم وقد قال الله : (قل أرأيتم ما أنزل الله لكم من رزق فجعلتم منه حلالاً وحراماً قل الله أذن لكم أم على الله تفترون. وما ظن الذين يفترون على الله الكذب يوم القيامة).³³

13 ومما نقمناه عليه أنه أول من تعدى في الصدقات وقد قال الله: (إنما الصدقات للفقراء والمساكين والعاملين عليها والمؤلفة قلوبهم وفي الرقاب والغارمين وفي سبيل الله وابن السبيل فريضة من الله والله عليم حكيم).³⁴ وقال الله: (وما كان لمؤمن ولا مؤمنة إذا قضى الله ورسوله أمراً أن يكون لهم الخيرة من أمرهم ومن يعص الله ورسوله فقد ضلّ ضلالاً مبيناً)³⁵

14 وأحدث عثمان منعه فرائض كان فرضها أمير المؤمنين عمر بن الخطاب رحمه الله عليه، وانتقص أصحاب بدر ألفاً من عطائهم، وكثر الذهب والفضة ولم ينفقها في سبيل الله: وقال الله: (والذين يكتزون الذهب والفضة ولا ينفقونها في سبيل الله فبشرهم بعذاب أليم. يوم يحمى عليها في نار جهنم فتكوى بها جباههم وجنوبهم وظهورهم هذا ما

³¹ سورة الحشر: آية 7

³² الحمى: هو موضع فيه كلاً يحمى من الناس وقد جعل لابل الصدقة منطقته خاصة بما في عهد أبي بكر وعمر ثم وسعه عثمان.

³³ سورة يونس: آية 59

³⁴ سورة التوبة: آية 60

³⁵ سورة الأحزاب: آية 36

كترتم لأنفسكم فذوقوا ما كنتم تكثرون).³⁶

15 ومّا نقمنا عليه أنه كان يضمّ كلّ ضالة إلى إبله ولا يردّها ولا يعرفها، وكان يأخذ من الإبل والغنم ممن وجد ما عنده من الناس وإن كانوا قد أسلموا عليها، وكان لهم في حكم الله أن لهم ما أسلموا عليه. وقال الله: (ولا تبخسوا الناس أشياءهم ولا تعثوا في الأرض مفسدين).³⁷ وقال: (لا تأكلوا أموالكم بينكم بالباطل إلا أن تكون تجارة عن تراض منكم ولا تقتلوا أنفسكم إنّ الله كان بكم رحيماً. ومن يفعل ذلك عدواناً وظلماً فسوف نصليه ناراً وكان ذلك على الله يسيراً).³⁸

16 ومّا نقمنا عليه أنه أخذ خمس الله لنفسه ويعطيها أقاربه ويجعل منهم عمالاً على أصحابه وكان ذلك تبديلاً لفرائض الله، وفرض الله الخمس لله ولرسوله (ولذي القربى واليتامى والمساكين وابن السبيل إن كنتم آمنتم بالله وما أنزلنا على عبدنا يوم الفرقان يوم التقى الجمعان والله على كلّ شيء قدير).³⁹

17 ومّا نقمنا عليه أنه منع أهل البحرين وأهل عمان⁴⁰ أن يبيعوا شيئاً من طعامهم حتى

³⁶ سورة التوبة: الآيتان 34-35

³⁷ سورة هود: آية 85

³⁸ سورة النساء: الآيتان 29-30

³⁹ سورة الأنفال: آية 41

⁴⁰ غالباً ما تكون عمان و البصرة تحت حكم واحد. وهذا الاتهام فيه شيء من الغرابة.

يباع طعام الإمارة، وكان ذلك تحريماً لما أحل الله (وأحل الله البيع وحرّم الربا).⁴¹

فلو أردنا أن نخبر بكثير من مظالم عثمان لم نحصها إلا ما شاء الله، وكل ما عدت عليكم من عمل عثمان يكفر الرجل أن يعمل ببعض هذا.

18 وكان من عمل عثمان أنه يحكم بغير ما أنزل الله وخالف سنة نبي الله والخليفتين الصالحين أبي بكر وعمر وقد قال الله: (ومن يشاقق الرسول من بعد ما تبين له الهدى ويتبع غير سبيل المؤمنين نولّه ما تولى ونصله جهنّم وساءت مصيراً).⁴²

وقال: (ومن لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فأولئك هم الظالمون).⁴³ (ألا لعنة الله على الظالمين)⁴⁴ (ومن يلعن الله فلن تجد له نصيراً).⁴⁵ وقال: (لا ينال عهدي الظالمين).⁴⁶ وقال: (ولا تركنوا إلى الذين ظلموا فتمسكم النار وما لكم من دون الله من أولياء ثم لا تنصرون).⁴⁷ وقال: (ومن لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فأولئك هم الظالمون)⁴⁸ ، (ومن لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فأولئك هم الفاسقون)⁴⁹ ، (ومن لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فأولئك هم الكافرون).⁵⁰ وقال:

⁴¹ سورة البقرة: آية 275

⁴² سورة النساء: آية 115

⁴³ سورة المائدة: آية 45

⁴⁴ سورة هود: آية 18

⁴⁵ سورة النساء: آية 52

⁴⁶ سورة البقرة: آية 124

⁴⁷ سورة هود: آية 113

⁴⁸ سورة المائدة: آية 45

⁴⁹ سورة المائدة: آية 49

⁵⁰ سورة المائدة: آية 44

(ألا لعنة الله على الظالمين).⁵¹

وقال: (ومن يلعن الله فلن تجد له نصيراً).⁵² وقال: (ولا تركنوا إلى الذين ظلموا فتمسكم

النار).⁵³ وقال: (وكذلك حقت كلمة ربك على الذين فسقوا أنهم لا يؤمنون).⁵⁴ فكل

هذه الآيات تشهد على عثمان، وإنما شهدنا بما شهدت هذه الآيات. (والله يشهد بما

أنزل إليك أنزله بعلمه والملائكة يشهدون وكفى بالله شهيداً).⁵⁵ وقال: (فورب السماء

والأرض إنه لحق مثل ما أنكم تنطقون).⁵⁶

19 فلما رأى المؤمنون الذي نزل به عثمان من معصية الله، والمؤمنون شهداء الله ناظرون

أعمال الناس، وكذلك قال الله: (اعملوا فسيرى الله عملكم ورسوله والمؤمنون

وستردون إلى عالم الغيب والشهادة فينبئكم بما كنتم تعملون).⁵⁷

وعد الله من الفتن، وقال الله: (الم~. أحسب الناس أن يتركوا أن يقولوا آمناً وهم لا

يفتنون. ولقد فتنا الذين من قبلهم فليعلمن الله الذين صدقوا وليعلمن الكاذبين).⁵⁸

20 فعلم المؤمنون أن طاعة عثمان على ذلك طاعة إبليس، فساروا إلى عثمان من أطراف

⁵¹ سورة هود: آية 18

⁵² سورة النساء: آية 52

⁵³ سورة هود: آية 113

⁵⁴ سورة يونس: آية 33

⁵⁵ سورة النساء: آية 166

⁵⁶ سورة الذاريات: آية 33

⁵⁷ سورة التوبة: آية 105

⁵⁸ سورة العنكبوت: الآيات 1-3

الأرض، واجتمعوا في ملأ من المهاجرين والأنصار وعامة أزواج النبي عليه الصلاة والسلام فأتوه فذكروه الله وأخبروه الذي أتى من معاصي الله، فزعم أنه يعرف الذي يقولون، وأنه يتوب إلى الله منه ويراجع الحق فيقبلوا منه الذي أتقاهم به من اعتراف الذنب والتوبة والرجوع إلى أمر الله فجامعوه وقبلوا منه. وكان حقاً على أهل الإسلام إذا اتقوا بالحق أن يقبلوه ويجامعوه ما استقام على الحق. فلما تفرق الناس على ما أتقاهم به من الحق نكث⁵⁹ عن الذي عاهدهم عليه. وعاد فيما تاب منه، فكتب في أدبهم أن تقطع أيديهم وأرجلهم من خلاف. فلما ظهر المؤمنون على كتابه ونكثه على العهد الذي عاهدهم عليه رجعوا فقتلوه بحكم الله، وقال الله: (وإن نكثوا أيمانهم من بعد عهدهم وطعنوا في دينكم فقاتلوا أئمة الكفر إنهم لا إيمان لهم لعلهم ينتهون).⁶⁰ فجامع أهل الإسلام ما شاء الله، وعمل بالحق، وقد يعمل الإنسان بالإسلام زماناً ثم يرتد عنه. وقال الله: (إن الذين ارتدوا على أديبارهم من بعد ما تبين لهم الهدى الشيطان سؤل لهم وأملى لهم).⁶¹

21 فلما استحلّ معصية الله وترك سنة من كان قبله من المؤمنين، علم المؤمنون أن الجهاد في سبيل الله أولى وأن الطاعة في مجاهدة عثمان على أحكامه. فهذا من خبر عثمان والذي فارقه فيه، ونطعن عليه اليوم، وطعن عليه المؤمنون قبلنا.

⁵⁹ نكث: نقض ما تعقده وتصلحه من بيعة وغيرها، ونقض العهد، ابن منظور لسان العرب ج14 ص278.

⁶⁰ سورة التوبة: آية 12

⁶¹ سورة محمد: آية 25

22 وذكرت أنه كان مع رسول الله وختنه،⁶² فقد كان علي بن أبي طالب أقرب إلى رسول الله وأحب إليه منه، وكان ختنه ومن أهل الإسلام. وأنت تشهد عليه بذلك وأنا بعد على ذلك، فكيف تكون قرابته من محمد صلى الله عليه نجاة إذا ترك الحق وضلّ كفرًا.

واعلم، إنما علامة كفر هذه الأمة الحكم بغير ما أنزل الله، ذلك بأن الله قال: (ومن لم يحكم بما أنزل الله فأولئك هم الكافرون).⁶³ فلا أصدق من الله قیلا، وقال: (فبأيّ حديث بعد الله وآياته تؤمنون).⁶⁴

23 فلا يغرنك يا عبد الملك بن مروان، عثمان عن نفسك، ولا تسند دينك إلى الرجال يتمنون ويريدون ويستدرجون من حيث لا يعلمون، فإنّ أملك الأعمال بخواتمها، وكتاب الله جديد ينطق بالحق أجازنا الله باتباعه أن نضلّ أو نبغي. فاعتصم بحبل الله يا عبد الملك واعتصم بالله، وإنه من يعتصم بالله يهده صراطاً مستقيماً. وهو حبل الله الذي أمر المؤمنين أن يعتصموا به ولا يتفرّقوا. وليس حبل الله الرجال من أيّهم حَسُنَ ينهبون ويطعنون، فأذكرك الله لما أن تدبرت القرآن فإنه حقّ. وقال الله: (أفلا يتدبرون القرآن أم على قلوب أقفالها).⁶⁵ فكن تابعا لما جاء من الله تهتدي، وبه تخاصم من خاصمك من الناس، وإليه تدعو وبه تحتجّ، فإنه من يكن القرآن حجته يوم القيامة به يخاصم من

⁶² الختن هو الصهر ويقال خانت فلانا مخاتنة وهو زوج فتاة القوم، ابن منظور، لسان العرب، ج4 ص26

⁶³ سورة المائدة: آية 44

⁶⁴ سورة الجاثية: آية 6

⁶⁵ سورة محمد: آية 24

خاصمه ويفلح في الدنيا والآخرة. فإنَّ الناس قد اختصموا (إنكم يوم القيامة عند ربكم تختصمون)،⁶⁶ فتعمل لما بعد الموت ولا يغرّتك بالله الغرور.

24 وأما قولك في شأن معاوية بن أبي سفيان أن الله قام معه وعجل نصره وأفلح حجه وأظهره على عدوه بطلب دم عثمان، فإن يكن يعتبر الدين من قبل الدولة أن يظهر الناس بعضهم على بعض في الدنيا فإننا لا نعتبر الدين بالدولة، وقد ظهر المسلمون على الكفار منا، ولينظر كيف يعملون، وقد ظهر الكفار على المسلمين لبيتلي المسلمين بذلك وعلى الكافرين. وقال: (وتلك الأيام نداؤها بين الناس وليعلم الله الذين آمنوا ويتخذ منكم شهداء والله لا يحب الظالمين. ولیمحص الله الذين آمنوا ويمحق الكافرين).⁶⁷

25 فإن كان الدين إذا ظهر الناس بعضهم على بعض فقد سمعت الذي أصاب المشركون من يوم أحد⁶⁸، وقد ظهر الذين قتلوا ابن عفان عليه وعلى شيعته يوم الدار⁶⁹، وظهر أيضاً عليّ على أهل البصرة⁷⁰ وهم شيعة عثمان، وظهر المختار⁷¹ على ابن زياد⁷² وأصحابه وهم شيعتكم، وظهر مصعب⁷³ الخبيث على المختار،⁷⁴ وظهر ابن السجف⁷⁵

⁶⁶ سورة الزمر: آية 31

⁶⁷ سورة آل عمران: الآيتان 140-141

⁶⁸ يشير إلى هزيمة المسلمين في معركة أحد من قبل مشركي مكة في 3 هجرية

⁶⁹ يشير إلى حصار دار عثمان الذي نجح عنه قتله

⁷⁰ إشارة إلى انتصار علي في معركة الجمل على طلحة والزبير

⁷¹ المختار ابن عبيد الثقفي نشأ المختار فكان من كبراء تثقيف وذوي الرأي والفصاحة والشجاعة والدهاء وقلة الدين. الذهبي سير أعلام

النبل ج1 ص538-44. أشار إلى ظهور المختار على عبيد الله بن زياد حيث أرسل إليه إبراهيم بن الأشتر فقتله الطبري

⁷² هو عبيد الله بن زياد بن أبيه ولّى البصرة 55 هجرية وله ثنتان وعشرون سنة وابغضه المسلمون بسبب قتله الحسين بن علي سنة 67. الذهبي

سير أعلام النبلاء ج3 ص445-48

⁷³ مصعب بن الزبير بن العوام القرشي الاسدي وهو إلى قتل المختار في 67 هجرية. الطبري ج6 ص118

على حبش ابن دلج⁷⁶ وأصحابه، وظهر أهل الشام على أهل المدينة⁷⁷، وظهر ابن الزبير⁷⁸ على أهل الشام بمكة يوم استفتحوا منها ما حرم الله عليكم وهم شيعتكم.

26 فإن كان هؤلاء على الدين فلا يعتبر الدين من قبل الدولة، فقد يظهر الناس بعضهم على بعض ويعطي الله رجالا ملكا في الدنيا، فقد أعطى فرعون⁷⁹ ملكا وظهر في الأرض، وقد أعطى الذي حاج إبراهيم في ربه⁸⁰، وقد أعطى فرعون ما سمعت.

27 ثم إنما اشترى معاوية الإمارة من الحسن بن علي، ثم لم يف له بالذي عاهده عليه وقال الله: (وأوفوا بعهد الله إذا عاهدتم ولا تنقضوا الأيمان بعد توكيدها وقد جعلتم الله عليكم كفيلا إن الله يعلم ما تفعلون. ولا تكونوا كالتي نقضت غزلها من بعد قوة أنكاثا تتخذون أيمانكم دخلا بينكم أن تكون أمة هي أربي من أمة إنما ييلوكم الله به وليبين لكم يوم القيامة ما كنتم فيه تختلفون).⁸¹

28 فلا تسال عن معاوية ولا صنيعه، غير أنا قد أدركناه ورأينا عمله وسيرته في الناس ولا نعلم من الناس أحدا أترك للقسمة التي قسمها الله، ولا لحكم حكمه الله، ولا أسفك

⁷⁴ ذكر ابن اباض قتل مصعب بن الزبير للمختار بن أبي عبيد الثقفي في عام 67 انظر الذهبي شمس الدين، سير أعلام النبلاء ج3 ص543.

⁷⁵ اسمه الحنيف بن السجف التميمي. الطبري ج5 ص611.

⁷⁶ حبش بن دلج القيني. ابن الأثير ج3 ص273.

⁷⁷ حاصر مسلم بن عقبة المري المدينة في عهد يزيد بن معاوية وهزم أهلها

⁷⁸ إشارة إلى أن عبد الله بن الزبير بن العوام هزم جيش أهل الشام في مكة اثر وفاة يزيد.

⁷⁹ ذكر فرعون في القرآن 64 مرة وهو مثال للظلم والجور انظر هذا المعنى سورة طه 20:79

⁸⁰ إشارة إلى الملك الذي جادل إبراهيم في وجود الله انظر سورة البقرة 285

⁸¹ سورة النحل: الآيات 91-92

لدم حرام منه، فلو لم يصب من الدماء إلا دم ابن سمية⁸² لكان في ذلك ما يكفره.

29 ثم استخلف ابنه يزيد⁸³ فاسقا من الناس لعينا يشرب الخمر المكفر فيكفيه من السوء،

وكان يتبع هواه بغير هدى من الله وقال الله: (ومن أضل ممن اتبع هواه بغير هدى من

الله إن الله لا يهدي القوم الظالمين).⁸⁴ فلم يخفى عمل معاوية ويزيد على كل ذي عقل

من الناس، فاتق الله يا عبد الملك ولا تخادع من نفسك في معاوية!!

30 فقد بلغنا أن أهل بيتكم⁸⁵ يطعنون على معاوية ويزيد وعملهما وما رأى من خبر

معاوية من بعدهما، فالذي طعنا عليهما وعليه وفارقناه عليه، فإن منهم فتنة كمن يكون

يتولى عثمان ومن بعده. فإن نشهد الله والملائكة أنا منهم براء ولهم أعداء، بأيدينا

وألستنا وقلوبنا، نعيش على ذلك ما عشنا ونموت عليه إذا متنا، ونبعث عليه إذا بعثنا،

نحاسب بذلك عند الله

31 وكتبت إلي تحذري الغلو⁸⁶ في الدين، وإني أعوذ بالله من الغلو في الدين، وسأبين لك

ما الغلو في الدين إذا جهلته، فإنه ما كان يقال على الله غير الحق ويعمل بغير كتابه الذي

بين لنا وسنة نبيه التي⁸⁷ بين لنا، اتباعك قوما قد ضلوا وأضلوا عن سواء السبيل. فذلك

⁸² زياد بن أبيه يلقب بابن سمية لانه لا يعرف له أبا.

⁸³ يزيد بن معاوية بن أبي سفيان تولى الخلافة بعد آبيه. و لعل المقصد هو عمار بن ياسر الذي قتل في صفين، والذي قال عنه الرسول " تقتله

القيظة

⁸⁴ سورة القصص آية 50

⁸⁵ ورد في الكتاب "أهل البيت" فصحت إلى "أهل بيتكم" من الجواهر المنتقاة للبرادي ص 164

⁸⁶ غلا في الدين والأمر يغلو غلوا: جاوز حده. هذا المعنى ذكر في القرآن "لا تغلو في دينكم" ابن منظور، لسان العرب ج 1 ص 112.

⁸⁷ ورد في الكتاب "الذي" فصحت إلى "التي" العقود الفضية سالم الحارثي 143

عثمان والأئمة من بعدهم وأنت على طاعتهم وتجامعهم على معصية الله

32 والله يقول: (يا أهل الكتاب لا تغلوا في دينكم ولا تقولوا على الله إلا الحق).⁸⁸ فهذا

سبيل أهل الغلو في الدين فليس من دعا إلى الله وإلى كتابه ورضي بحكمه، وغضب لله حين عصي أمره، وأخذ بحكمه حين ضيع وتركت سنة نبيه.

33 وكتبت إلي تعرض على الخوارج، تزعم أنهم يغلون في دينهم ويفارقون أهل الإسلام،

وتزعم أنهم يتبعون غير سبيل المؤمنين وإنني آيئ لك سبيلهم، إنهم أصحاب عثمان،

والذي أنكروا عليه ما أحدث من تغيير السنة. فارقوه حين أحدث وترك حكم الله،

وفارقوه حين عصى ربه، وهم أصحاب علي بن أبي طالب حين حكم عمرو بن العاص

وترك حكم الله، فأنكروه عليه وفارقوه فيه وأبوا أن يقرؤا لحكم البشر دون حكم كتاب

الله، فهم لمن بعدهم أشد عداوة واشد مفارقة. كانوا يتولون في دينهم وسننهم رسول الله

-صلى الله عليه وسلم- وأبا بكر وعمر بن الخطاب، ويدعون إلى سبيلهم ويرضون

بسننهم على ذلك، وكانوا يخرجون وإليه يدعون وعليه يفارقون. وقد علم من عرفهم من

الناس ورأى عملهم أنهم كانوا أحسن الناس عملاً وأشد قتالا في سبيل الله. وقال الله: (

قاتلوا الذين يلونكم من الكفار وليجدوا فيكم غلظة واعلموا أن الله مع المتقين).⁸⁹

34 فهذا خبر الخوارج، نشهد الله والملائكة أنا لمن عاداهم أعداء وأنا لمن والاهم أولياء

⁸⁸ سورة النساء آية 171

⁸⁹ سورة التوبة آية 123.

بأيدينا وألستنا وقلوبنا، على ذلك نعيش ما عشنا، ونموت على ذلك إذا متنا، غير أنا نبرأ إلى الله من ابن الأزرق وأتباعه من الناس، لقد كانوا خرجوا حين خرجوا على الإسلام فيما ظهر لنا ولكنهم ارتدوا عنه وكفروا بعد إيمانهم، فنبرأ إلى الله منهم.

35 أما بعد فإنك كتبت إلي أن أكتب إليك بجواب كتابك، وأجتهد في النصيحة، وإني آيين لك إن كنت تعلم وأفضل ما كتبت إليك به، وذكرني بالله أن آيين لك فإني قد بينت لك بجهد نفسي، وأخبرتكم خبر الأمة، وكان حقاً علي أن أنصح لك وآيين لك ما قد علمت. إن الله يقول: (إن الذين يكتُمون ما أنزلنا من البينات والهدى من بعد ما بيناه في الكتاب أولئك يلعنهم الله ويلعنهم اللاعنون. إلا الذين تابوا وأصلحوا وبينوا فأولئك أتوب عليهم وأنا التواب الرحيم).⁹⁰ فإن الله لم يتخذني عبداً وأن أكفر بربي، ولا أخادع الناس بشيء ليس في نفسي، وأخالف إلى ما أمهى عنه، فأمرني علانية غير سر، أَدْعُو إلى كتاب الله وليحلوا حلاله ويحرموا حرامه ويرضوا بحكمه ويتوبوا إلى ربهم ويراجعوا كتاب الله، ولئن أَدْعُوكم إلى كتاب الله ليحكم بيني وبينكم في الذي اختلفوا فيه ونحرم ما حرم الله ونحكم بما حكم الله ونبرأ ممن برئ الله منه ورسوله، ونتولى من يتولاه الله، ونطيع من أحل لنا طاعته في كتابه، ونعصي من أمر الله بمعصيته. أن نطيعه فهذا الذي أدركنا عليه نبينا محمد -صلى الله عليه وسلم-. وأن هذه الأمة لم تحل⁹¹ حراماً ولم

⁹⁰ سورة البقرة: الآيتان 159-160 .

⁹¹ ورد في الكتاب "وتحرم" والصواب "وتحل" مخطوط كشف الغممة للازكوي ورقه 232

تسفك دماء إلا حين تركوا كتاب ربهم الذي أمرهم أن يعتصموا به، ويأمنوا عليه، وأنهم لا يزالون مفترقين مختلفين حتى يراجعوا كتاب الله وسنة نبيه وينتصحو كتاب الله على أنفسهم، ويحكموه إلى ما اختلفوا فيه. فإن الله يقول: (وما اختلفتم فيه من شيء فحكمه إلى الله ذلكم الله ربي عليه توكلت وإليه أنيب).⁹²

36 وأن هذا هو السبيل الواضح لا يشبه به شيء من السبل، وهو الذي هدى الله به من كان قبلنا، محمدا -صلى الله عليه وسلم- والخليفين الصالحين من بعده، فلا يضل من اتبعه ولا يهتدي من تركه، وقال (وأن هذا صراطي مستقيما فاتبعوه ولا تتبعوا السبل فتفرق بكم عن سبيله ذلكم وصاكم به لعلكم تتقون).⁹³ فأحذر أن تفرق بك السبل عن سبيله، ويزين لك الضلالة باتباعك هواك فيما جمعت عليه الرجال، فإنهم لن يغنوا عنك من الله شيئا، إنما هي الأهواء والدين.

37 إنما يتبع الناس في الدنيا والآخرة إمامين، إمام هدى، وإمام ضلالة. أما إمام الهدى فهو يحكم بما أنزل الله ويقسم بقسمه ويتبع كتاب الله، وهم الذين قال الله: (وجعلن منهم أئمة يهدون بأمرنا لما صبروا وكانوا بآياتنا يوقنون).⁹⁴ وهؤلاء أولياء المؤمنين الذين أمر الله بطاعتهم، ونهى عن معصيتهم.

38 أما إمام الضلالة فهو الذي يحكم بغير ما أنزل الله ويقسم بغير ما قسم الله، ويتبع هواه

⁹² سورة الشورى: آية 10.

⁹³ سورة الأنعام: آية 153.

⁹⁴ سورة السجدة: آية 24.

بغير سنة من الله فذلك كفر كما سمي الله، ونهى عن طاعتهم، وأمر بجهادهم، وقال: (فلا تطع الكافرين وجاهدهم به جهادا كبيرا)⁹⁵ فإنه حق أنزله بالحق وينطق به، وليس بعد الحق إلا الضلال فأني تصرفون. ولا يضرين الذكر عنا صفحا، ولا تشكن في كتب الله، ولا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله، فإنه من لم ينفعه كتاب الله، لم ينفعه غيره.

39 كتبت إلي أن أكتب إليك بمرجوع كتابك، فإني قد كتبت إليك، وأنا أذكرك بالله العظيم إن استطعت بالله لما قرأت كتابي ثم تدبر فيه وأنت فارغ ثن تدبره، فقد كتبت إليك بجواب كتابك وبينت لك ما علمت ونصحت لك. فإني أذكرك بالله العظيم لما قرأت كتابي وتدبرته، واكتب ألي إن استطعت بجواب كتابي إذا كتبت إليك، إنما أتنلزع فيه أنا وأنت وأنزع عليه بينة من كتاب الله أصدق فيه قولك فلا تعرض لي بالدنيا فإنه لا رغبة لي في الدنيا، وليست من حاجتي، ولكن لتكون نصحتك لي في الدين، ولما بعد الموت فإن ذلك أفضل النصيحة. فإن الله قادر أن يجمع بيننا وبينك على الطاعة، فإنه لا خير لمن لم يكن على طاعة الله. وبالله التوفيق وفيه الرضى، والسلام عليك والحمد لله، وصلى الله على نبيه محمد وآله وسلم تسليما.

⁹⁵ . سورة الفرقان : آية 52.

CHAPTER FOUR

A TRANSLATION OF IBN IBĀD'S LETTER TO 'ABD AL-MALIK

From 'Abd Allāh b. Ibād to Abd al-Malik b. Marwān¹:

1 Peace be on you. I commend the praise of Allāh to you, other than Whom there is no god and I advise you to fear Allāh because the reward [of Allāh] will be for those who are pious. We will return to Allāh and He will accept only those who are pious.

2 Your letter was brought to me by Sinān b. 'Āṣim². You wrote to me that I should reply to you. Therefore I have written [a letter] to you. In it are things which you will accept and things which you will reject. You claim that you will only recognise what I mention in it from the Book of Allāh. I urge you to [examine it] in terms of obedience to Allāh, following His command and the Sunnah of His Prophet. What you have denied is not denied by Allāh, and what I had mentioned about 'Uthmān³ and what I have raised about the affairs of the Imams is such that no-one can deny the testimony of Allāh in His Book through what He has revealed to His Messenger. Those who fail to judge by what Allāh has revealed, "they are unbelievers"⁴ (5:44), "wrongdoers" (5:46) and "rebels" (5:47).

3 I have not mentioned anything to you about ‘Uthmān and the Imams except what is right and I will give the evidence of that from the Qur’ān which has been revealed to His Prophet. I will write to you about what I have written about ‘Uthmān and I will inform you about the reports about ‘Uthmān and what we criticise him for in them and I will explain his affair and what ‘Uthmān did. As you mentioned, he was an early in Islam and acted according to it. However, Allāh did not protect His servants from sedition and apostasy from Islam.

4 Allāh had sent Muḥammad with the truth and sent down the Book in which there was explanation for everything. It judges between the people in what they differ: “It is a guide and mercy to all who believe.” (7:52) Allāh has declared permissible what is permissible and forbidden what is forbidden and laid down His law, explained His judgment made clear His limits. He said: “Those are the limits set by Allāh do not exceed them.” (2: 187) He also said: “If anyone transgresses the limits of Allāh, such a person is wrongdoer.” (2:229)

5 Allāh has given His word. There is no choice concerning it for His servants. He ordered His Prophet to follow His Book. Allāh said to the Prophet: “But follow that which came to you from your Lord.” (33:2). He also said “And when we have recited it to you, then follow its recital. Then it is for us to make it clear to you.”(75: 18-19)

Therefore the Prophet Muḥammad acted according to the order of his Lord and ‘Uthmān was with him and those of his Companions whom Allāh wished. They saw

that the Messenger of Allāh did not change the order of Allāh and did not forbid what Allāh had made duties. He did not make legitimate anything, which Allāh had forbidden and he did not forbid anything, which Allāh had permitted. He only judged between the people according to what Allāh had revealed. He used to say: "I fear, if I disobey my Lord the torment of a mighty day." (6:15). He lived, as Allāh wished, following what Allāh commanded. He used to follow what came to him from Allāh. The believers were with him. He taught them and they looked up to what he practiced until he died. They were pleased with him. We ask Allāh [to enable us] to follow his path and to act according to his Sunnah. Then Allāh left to His servants the Book which Muḥammad brought and His limits. No one of the people who is guided will be guided except by following it. No one who goes astray will go astray except by abandoning it.

6 After the Prophet, Abū Bakr⁵ took authority over the people. He followed the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of his Prophet. The Muslims were pleased and they united around him. None of Muslims withdrew from him in any law which he made or division [of wealth] which he made until he died. Then 'Umar⁶ came after him. He was strong in command, fierce against the hypocrites. He followed the path of those who had gone before him in [accepting] the judgement of the Book of Allāh. Allāh tested him with conquests in the world in a way in which He had not tested his two predecessors. He was able to carry the message of Islam to the world. Then he died while the Muslims were still maintaining their unity and their witness still existed. The believers were witnesses on behalf of Allāh. Allāh said: "Thus have we made of

you an *ummah* justly balanced that you might be witnesses over mankind and the Messenger be a witness over you.” (2:143)

7 Then the Muslims appointed ‘Uthmān. He acted, as Allāh wished, according to what the people of Islam knew until the world opened up for him and the treasure of the earth was in his hands as Allāh wished. After that he introduced matters by which his two predecessors had not acted before him. At that, time the people were close to their time. When the Muslims saw what ‘Uthmān had done, they came to him and spoke to him and mentioned the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of those believers who were before him. Allāh had said: “And who does more wrong than the one to whom We have recited the signs of his Lord and then he turns away from them? Verily from those who transgress We shall exact retribution.” (32:22) He was diverted from the verses of Allāh which they mentioned. He used force against them as Allāh wished. He beat some of them, jailed others, and exiled others to distant places as Allāh wished. [The reason for] that was that they reminded him of the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of His Prophet and of the believers who were before him. Allāh said: “And who does more wrong than the one who is reminded of the signs of his Lord, but turns away from them forgetting the deeds which his hands have sent forth?” (18:57)

8 I will make clear to you, ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, what the believers disapproved of concerning ‘Uthmān and why we separated from him in view of the wrong acts which he made lawful. Perhaps you might be ignorant and heedless of what he had

done, because you are one of his followers in religion (*dīn*) and his desire. ‘Abd al-Malik, do not let the desires of ‘Uthmān overcome you and regard them as lies. ‘Uthmān will not protect you from Allāh in anyway. By Allāh, ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, [think] before there is fighting from a distance and before an inevitable fate which is the allotted period of life. This is the reason why the believers disapproved of ‘Uthmān and separated from him and we also separated from him. Allāh said: “And who is more unjust than those who forbid that Allāh’s name may be glorified and mentioned much in Allāh’s mosques and strive for their ruin? It was not fitting that such should themselves enter them except in fear. For them there is disgrace in this world, and they will have a great torment in the Hereafter.” (2:114) ‘Uthmān was the first one to prevent judgment by the Book of Allāh in the mosques.

9 Among the things for which reprove of him and we separated ourselves from him is that Allāh said to Muḥammad: “And turn not away those who invoke their Lord morning and afternoon, seeking His face, you are accountable for them in nothing, and they are accountable for you in nothing, that you may turn them away, and thus become of the unjust.” (6:52). He was the first in this *ummaḥ* to drive out and exile members of it. Among those whom he exiled from Medina were Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī,⁷ Muslim al-Juhanī⁸ and Nāfi’ b. al-Ḥiṭām. He exiled from the people of Kūfah,⁹

Ka’b b. Dhī al-Ḥanakah,¹⁰ Abū al-Raḥl al-Wajjāj, Jundab¹¹ b. Zuhayr- Jundab was the one who killed magician with whom al-Walīd b. ‘Uqbah¹² used to play- ‘Amr b. Zurārah,¹³ Zayd b. Ṣuḥan¹⁴, Aswad b. Dhurayh,¹⁵ Yazīd b. Qays al-Ḥamadānī¹⁶ and

Kardūs b. al-Ḥaḍramī among a great number of the people of Kūfah. He exiled from the people of Baṣrah, ‘Āmir b ‘Abd Allāh Al-Qasrī¹⁷ and Madh‘ūr al-‘Abdī.¹⁸ I cannot count all of the believers.

10 Among the things for which we reprove him is that he had appointed his [half] brother al-Walīd b. ‘Uqbah over the believers. He used to play with magic and he led the prayer while he was drunk. He was a grave sinner (*fasiq*) in the religion of Allāh and he was appointed because he was a relative instead of being one the believers of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. There was only a short time between the period of Allāh and His Messenger and the believers.

11 Another of the things for which we reprove of ‘Uthmān was that he made wealth circulate among the wealthy despite Allāh’s saying: “In order that it may not make a circuit among the wealthy among you.” (59:7) He changed the word of Allāh and followed his desire.

12 Another thing which we rejected from him was his demarcating land¹⁹ which he made as protected [land] for himself and his family. His actions prevented the rain coming from the sky, the sustenance given to the people and their animals by Allāh. Allāh said: “Say: see the things that Allāh has sent down to you for sustenance. And you have made them lawful and unlawful. Say: Has Allāh permitted you or do you intend to invent lies against Allāh? And what think those who invent lies against Allāh on the day of Judgment? (10:56-60)

13 Another thing we rejected from him was that he was the first one to transgress in the distribution of the alms (*ṣadaqah*). Allāh had said: “Alms are for the poor and the needy, and those employed to administer the funds, for those whose hearts have been reconciled, for those in bondage and in debt, in the cause of Allāh and for the wayfarer, a duty imposed by Allāh. And Allāh is all-knower and all-wise.”(9:60)

Allāh also said: “It is not fitting for a believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by Allāh and His Messenger to have any option about their decision. If any one disobeys Allāh and His Messenger, he is indeed on a clearly wrong path.” (33: 35)

14 ‘Uthmān committed an offence (*aḥḍatha*) when he prevented the payments (*farā’iḍ*)²⁰ which has been assigned by the Commander of the Faithful, ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, and reduced the stipend of those who had participated in the Battle of Badr by a thousand dirhams. He started to hoard (*kānz*) gold and silver and did not spend it in the way of Allāh. Allāh said: “And there are those who hoard gold and silver and spend it not in the way of Allāh: announce unto them a most grievous penalty. On the Day when that will be heated in the fire of Hell and with it will be branded their foreheads, their flanks and their backs. This is the treasure you hoarded for yourselves. Now taste of what you used to hoard.” (9:34-5)

15 Another thing which we rejected from him was that he used to put a lost camel with his own without returning it and announcing that it was lost. He used to take some of the camels and sheep from those people with whom he found them even though those people had become Muslims. In accordance with the law of Allāh they

were theirs insofar as whatever they had when they became Muslims was theirs. Allāh said: “Do not withhold from the people the things that are their due, commit not evil in the land, intent to mischief. “ (11:85) Allāh also said: “Do not consume your property among yourselves in vanities, but let there be amongst you traffic and trade by mutual goodwill, nor kill yourselves; for verily Allāh has been to you most merciful, and whoever does that hostility and unjustly, We will burn him in Hell-fire. That is easy for Allāh.”(4:29-30)

16 Another thing which we rejected from him was that he took the *khums* for himself and gave it to his relatives and made them governors (‘*ummāl*’) over the Companions of the Prophet. This was to change the injunctions of Allāh. Allāh had required the *khums* be for Allāh and his Messenger: “It is for the near kin, orphans, the needy, wayfarers, if you believe in Allāh and whatever We sent down to Our servant on the day of separation, the day on which the two groups met. Allāh has power over everything.” (8:41).

17 Another thing that we rejected of him is that he prevented (*mana’*) the people of Bahrain and Oman from selling their produce until the state had sold its own produce. That was forbidding what Allāh has made lawful. Allāh said: “But Allāh has permitted trade and forbidden usury.” (2.275).

If we want to tell about ‘Uthmān’s many misdeeds (*mazālim*) we can only count them if Allāh wills. What I have told you about some of ‘Uthmān’s deeds is enough to show that by committing some of them he was committing unbelief (*kufīr*).

18 Among the acts of ‘Uthmān was that he made judgments which were not in accordance with the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of the Prophet and the two righteous Caliphs, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Allāh said: “If anyone contends with the Messenger even after guidance has been plainly conveyed to him, and follows a path other than that becoming to men of faith, We shall leave him in the path he has chosen, and burn him in Hell - What an evil destiny!” (4:115) Allāh also said: “And if any fail to judge by what Allāh hath revealed, they are wrongdoers. (5:45) Allāh also said: “Behold the curse of Allāh is on those who do wrong.” (11:18) Allāh has mentioned: “Whoever Allāh cursed, will never find a helper.” (4:52) He said: “But My promise is not within the reach of evildoers.” (2:124) Allāh said: “And incline not to those who do wrong or the fire will seize you, and you have no *awliyā*’ other than Allāh, nor shall you be helped.” (11:113) He said: “And whosoever does not judge by that which Allāh has revealed, such are the wrongdoers;” (5:45) “the rebels;” (5:47) “and the disbelieves;” (5:44) He said: “The curse of Allāh is on the wrongdoers, the oppressors.” (8:18) “And he whom Allāh cursed, will not find for him any helper.” (4:52) He said: “Incline not to those who do wrong or the fire will seize you.” (11:113) He said: “Thus is the word of your Lord justified against those who do wrong that they will not believe.” (11:33) All these verses were a testimony against ‘Uthmān and we only testify according to the testimony of the verses. Allāh

said: "But Allāh bears witness to that which He has sent down to you. He has sent it down with His knowledge and the angels bear witness. And Allāh is all-sufficient as a witness." (6:166) He said: "Then, by the Lord of the heaven and the earth, it is the truth, just as it is the truth that you can speak." (51:23)

19 When the believers saw that 'Uthmān had disobeyed Allāh, they were witnesses of Allāh, observers of the actions of the people. As Allāh said: "And say: "Do deeds! Allāh will see your deeds and so will the Messenger and the believers. and you will be brought back to the all-knower of the unseen and the seen. Then He will inform you of what you used to do." (9:105)

He allowed the dispute between what is wrong and what is right stop and what has been promised of the temptation (*fitan*). Allāh said: "Alif-Lam-Mim. Do people think that they will be left alone because they say 'We believe' and will not be tested. And We indeed tested those who have gone before them. And Allāh will certainly make known the truth of those who are true, and will certainly make known those who are liars." (29:1-2)

20 So the believers knew that the obedience of 'Uthmān in that is the obedience of Iblīs. They went to 'Uthmān from distant parts of the land after they gathered with a group of Muhajrīn and Anṣār and the Prophet's wives. They went to him and told him the sins that he committed. He claimed that he recognised what they had told him, and he repented for what he had done and he would return to the right. They

accepted what he had said that he admitted his sins and had repented, and that he would follow the orders of Allāh. They accepted that.²¹ It is a duty for the people of Islam when they are presented with what is right to accept it and to become united with a man as long as he follows what is right. When they went away in a state of believing that they were presented with what is right, he broke his agreement with them and returned to [the actions] which he had repented from. He wrote [letters] after them that their hands and legs should be cut off on opposite sides of the body (*khilāf*). When his letters and the breach of his promise became apparent to the believers, they returned and killed him in accordance with the law of Allāh.²² Allāh said: “But if they violate their oaths after their covenant and attack your religion with disapproval and criticism, then fight the leaders of disbelief (*kufṛ*). For surely their oaths are nothing to them so that they may stop evil actions.” (9:12). The people of Islam were united with what Allāh wished and acted according to what was right when a man (i.e. ‘Uthmān) acted according to Islam at one time and then apostasised from it. Allāh said: “Verily, those who have turned back as disbelievers after the guidance has been manifested to them, Satan has beautified them for their false hopes and Allāh prolonged their term (age).” (47:25).

21 When he allowed disobedience (*ma‘ṣiyah*) and abandoned the Sunnah of the believers before, they knew that *jihād* on path of Allāh was more appropriate [for them] and that obedience [to Allāh] was to strive (*mujāhadah*) against the [wicked] ruling of ‘Uthmān.

This is the [true] account of ‘Uthmān and why we separated from him. We find fault with him today as the believers found fault with him before us.

22 You mentioned that he was with the Messenger of Allāh and was his son-in-law, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib was closer (in kinship) to the Messenger of Allāh and was more loved by him. He was [also] his son-in-law and one of the people of Islam. You are a witness for him of that as am I. However, how could his relationship with Muḥammad save him if he abandoned truth (*al-ḥaqq*) and went astray in unbelief (*kufīr*). You must know that the sign of unbelief of this *ummah* is its unbelief [when] it makes a judgment through something other than what Allāh has revealed. Allāh said: “Those who did not judge by what Allāh has revealed, they are unbelievers.” (5:44) Nothing is truer than the words of Allāh. “In what speech will they believe after Allāh and His verses?” (45:6)

23 O ‘Abd al-Malik, do not let ‘Uthmān mislead you from your [true self] and do not make your religion dependent on men who follow their own desires, and entice and deceive [men] in terms of what they do not know. The [best] of acts to belong to a person are their final acts. The Book of Allāh is [always] relevant (*jadīd*), mentioning the truth. Allāh gives us protection by following it against going astray and committing sins. So hold fast, ‘Abd al-Malik and have recourse to Allāh. Whoever has recourse to Allāh, it is the rope of Allāh which He enjoins the believers to have recourse to and they will not be scattered. The rope of Allāh is not the men who, [even though] one of them may be good, pillage and damage. Remember Allāh

when you reflect on the Qur'ān. It is true. Allāh has said: "Do they not think deeply or are their hearts locked up from understanding it." (47:24) Follow what has been revealed from Allāh and you will be guided. By it you should oppose the people who oppose you, to it you should summon people. Whoever has the Qur'ān as his proof on the Day of Resurrection, opposing those who oppose him with it, will be successful in the world and the thereafter. The people have disputed: "Then, on the Day of Resurrection, you will be disputing before your Lord." (39:31) Therefore, work for what is after death and do not let temptations mislead you with regard to Allāh.

24 As for what you said about Mu'āwiyah b. Abī Sufyān,²³ that Allāh was with him, quickened his victory, gave success to his dispute and made him victorious against his enemy in seeking vengeance for the blood of 'Uthmān - if religion is considered in terms of victory (*dawlah*), [namely] that some people gain victory over others in the world, we do not consider religion, in terms of victory. The Muslims gained victory over the unbelievers as a grace [from Allāh] and in order to see how they would act. On the other hand, the unbelievers gained victory over the Muslims in order that the Muslims might be tested by that, and [would eventually overcome] the unbelievers. As Allāh said: "And so are the days, we give to men by turns, that Allāh may test those who believe, and that he may take martyrs from you. And Allāh likes not the wrongdoers. And that Allāh may test the believers and destroy the disbelievers." (3:140-1)

25 If religion is when some people gain victory over others, you heard what the polytheists achieved at the Battle of Uhud,²⁴ that those who killed [‘Uthmān] b. ‘Affān gained victory over him and his supporters on the day of the siege of his house,²⁵ that ‘Alī gained victory over the people of Baṣrah²⁶ who were the supporters of ‘Uthmān, that al-Mukhtār²⁷ gained victory over Ibn Ziyād²⁸, and his followers, that Mu‘ṣab,²⁹ the dreadful,³⁰ gained victory over al-Mukhtār, that Ibn Sajaf³¹ gained victory over Hūbaysh b. Duljah³² and his supporters,³³ that the Syrians gained victory over the people Medina³⁴ and Ibn al-Zubayr³⁵ gained victory over the Syrians at Mecca on the day when the Syrians sought to conquer what Allāh had forbidden for you and they were your supporters.

26 If these were acting according to religion, then religion cannot be considered in terms victory, for some of them gained victory over others and Allāh was giving dominion (*mulk*) just as he gave Pharaoh³⁶ dominion and he had power over the land. Allāh [also] gave dominion to the one who disputed with Abraham³⁷ about his Lord and He gave [dominion] to Pharaoh as you have just heard.

27 Mu‘āwiyah had only bought the leadership from al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī.³⁸ Then he did not keep the covenant (*‘ahd*) which he made with him and Allāh said: “And fulfil the covenant of Allāh, when you have covenanted, and break not the oath after you have confirmed them, and indeed you have appointed Allāh your surety. Verily! Allāh knows what you do. And be not like those who undo the thread which has been spun

after it has become strong, by making your oaths a meaning of deception among yourselves, lest a nation be more numerous than another nation. Allāh only tests you by this. And on the Day of Resurrection, He will certainly make clear to you that wherein you used to differ.”(16: 91-2)

28 Do not ask about Mu‘āwiyah and his actions and deeds. We know him and his actions and his conduct (*sīrah*) towards the people. We do not know anyone worse in abandoning the distribution (*qismah*) of *fa’y* which Allāh had set up, and in the judgment of Allāh and worse in shedding forbidden blood, and if he had been only responsible for the blood that had been shed by Ibn Summayyah,³⁹ it is enough to consider him as an unbeliever.

29 Then he appointed his son Yazīd ⁴⁰ who was a grave sinner (*fāsiq*). He drank wine which is an act of unbelief and he was the follower of his desire (*hawah*) without Allāh’s guidance. Allāh said: “Then know that they only follow their lusts. And who is more astray than one who follows his own lusts without guidance from Allāh? Verily! Allāh guides not the people who are wrongdoers.” (28:50).

The actions of Mu‘āwiyah and Yazīd were not hidden to men of wisdom. So fear Allāh, ‘Abd al-Malik and do not deceive yourself about Mu‘āwiyah.

30 We have learnt that [some people from] your house criticise Mu‘āwiyah and Yazīd and declare them to be wrong in what they did. [This is] what we criticise the

two of them for and the reason for which we have separated ourselves. However, there is among them (i.e. the people of your house) [a group who advocate] discord just as those who associated with ‘Uthmān and those who came after him. We testify before Allāh and the angels that we dissociate ourselves from them and are enemies of them with our hands, tongues and hearts. We will live according to that as long as we live and will die according to that when we die. We will be risen from the dead according to that when we rise from the dead. We will hold that to our account before Allāh.

31 You have written to me to warn me not to be extreme in religion. I seek refuge with Allāh from being extreme in religion. It is what has been claimed about Allāh which is not in accordance with the truth; it is acting according to something other than His Book which He has explained to us and according to something other than the Sunnah of His Prophet which he has explained to us. You are following a group who are misguided and misguide others from the path [of Allāh]. That is ‘Uthmān and the Imams after him. You are in obedience to them, you are united with them in disobedience to Allāh.

32 Allāh said: “O, people of scripture! Do not exceed the limits in your religion, nor say of Allāh anything but the truth.” (2:171) This is the way of the people who commit excesses in religion, and it is not those who make call to Allāh and His Book and accept His judgment and are angry for Allāh when His order disobeyed, and who

hold His judgment when it is deliberately abandoned and the Sunnah of His Prophet is abandoned.

33 You wrote me raising [the matter of] the Khārijites. You claim that they were extreme in their religion and had separated themselves from the people of Islam. You [also] claim that they were following another path than the path of the believers. I will explain to you their path. They were colleagues (*aṣḥāb*) of ‘Uthmān. What they denounced was the innovations (*aḥdatha*) which he had introduced in changing the *Sunnah*. They separated from him when he introduced innovations and abandoned the law of Allāh. They separated from him when he disobeyed his Lord. They were colleagues of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib until he made ‘Amr⁴¹ b. al-‘Āṣ an arbitrator. They denounced that to him and they separated themselves from him. They refused to accept the judgment of men instead of the judgment of the Book of Allāh. They were firmer in enmity and separation toward those who were after them. They used to take as their authority in their religion and practice the Messenger of Allāh and Abū Bakr and ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. They used to summon [men] to their path and they were content with their practices on that basis. They would leave [the rest of the Muslims] and summon them to that and separate from them on that basis. Those of the people who were acquainted with them knew and saw from their actions that they were the last of people in actions and fiercest to fight on the path of Allāh. Allāh said: “Fight those of the disbelievers who are close to you and let them find harshness in you, and know Allāh is with those who are pious.” (9:123)

34 This is the account (*khavar*) of the Khārijites and we make Allāh and His angels our witnesses that whoever became their enemy, we are his enemies. Whoever is loyal to them we are loyal to him with our hands, hearts and tongues. We will live by that as long as we live and we will die by that. We are innocent of what Ibn al-Azraq and his followers have done. When they left [the rest of the Muslims], they left [them] on the basis of Islam as it appears to us. However, they apostasised and became unbelievers after [having had] belief. We dissociate ourselves before Allāh from them.⁴²

35 As for the rest, you have written to me to write you an answer to your letter and to be sincere in advice. I will explain to you, even though you should know, that it is the most excellent of what I have written to you. You adjured me before Allāh to explain to you and I have explained to you with my utmost. I have informed you of the account of the *ummah*. It was my duty to give you good advice and to explain to you what I know. Allāh said: "Verily, those who conceal the clear proofs, evidences and guidance which we have sent down, after we have made it clear for the people in the Book, they are the ones cursed by Allāh and cursed by the cursers except those who repent and do righteous deeds, and openly declare the truth which they concealed." These, I will accept their repentance. And I am the one who accepts repentance, the most merciful." (2:159-160) Allāh has not made me a servant so that I should disbelieve in my Lord. I will not deceive the people with anything which is not in my heart (*nafs*) nor will I oppose [Him] through what He has forbidden. My affairs are open, not secret. I summon them to the Book so that they make lawful

what He has made lawful, forbid what He has forbidden, are content with His law (*ḥukm*), repent to their Lord and return to the Book of Allāh. Therefore I summon you to the Book of Allāh so that it may judge between you and me in those matters on which they disputed. We have forbidden what Allāh forbade. We judge by what Allāh judged. We dissociate ourselves from those whom Allāh and His Messenger have dissociated. We associate ourselves with those whom Allāh has associated. We obey those whom Allāh has made lawful to us in His Book. We disobey those whom Allāh ordered us to disobey so that we obey Him. This is what our Prophet had made us aware of. This *ummah* did not make lawful what was forbidden nor shed blood except when they abandoned the Book of their Lord which He ordered them to hold fast to and commit themselves to. They will remain scattered and disputing until they return to the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of His Prophet. They should make the Book of Allāh their true advice. They should make it the judge in their dispute. Allāh said: “And in whatsoever you differ, the decision thereof is with Allāh, and say: O Muḥammad, such is Allāh, my Lord in Whom I put my trust and to Him I turn in all of my affairs and in repentance.” (42:10)

36 This is the clear path, no other paths are like it. Allāh has guided those before us with it and Muḥammad and his two ⁴³ righteous Caliphs after him. Whoever follows it will be guided and whoever does not follow it will be misguided. Allāh said: “And verily, this is My straight path, so follow it and follow not the other paths, for they will separate you from His path. This He had ordained for you that you may become the pious.”(6:153)

37 By following your desire it will make going astray seem pleasing to you in matters which men congregate towards. They will not be sufficient for you from Allāh. They are only desires and custom (*dīn*). There are two Imams for people to follow with regard to this world and the Hereafter, the Imam of guidance and the Imam of error. The Imam of guidance judges according to what Allāh has revealed, divides [wealth] as Allāh divides it, follows the Book of Allāh. They are those whom Allāh described: “And we made from among them leaders, giving guidance under Our command, when they were patient and used to believe in Our verses.” (32:24) Those were the *awliyāʾ* of the believers and Allāh ordered the people (*al-nās*) to obey them.

38 The misguided (*ḍalālāh*) Imams did not judge according to the Qurʾān and their distribution is the contrary to that of Allāh. They follow their own desire (*hawāh*) without Allāh's guidance and that is unbelief (*kufṛ*). Allāh forbids obedience to them and ordered us to make *jihād* against them. Allāh said: “So obey not the disbelievers, but strive against them with the utmost endeavour with the Qurʾān.” (25:52) It is true, it was revealed with the truth and it speaks with the truth. There is nothing beyond truth except error. Now you will be dismissed [if you follow error]. Do not let the reminder [of Allāh] be kept silent. Do not have doubt about the Book of Allāh. There is no power or strength except with Allāh. Whoever the Book of Allāh does not benefit, nothing else will benefit him.

39 You wrote to me that I should write to you with a reply to your letter. I have written to you and I adjure you before Almighty Allāh, if you are given the ability by Allāh to read my letter, reflect on it when you have free time. Then reflect on it [again]. I have written to you the reply to your letter. I have explained to you what I knew and I have advised you sincerely. I adjure you before Almighty Allāh when you have read my letter and reflected on it, write to me if you are able, an answer to my letter when I have written to you. You and I are only disputing. Therefore dispute against [my letter] with evidence from the Book of Allāh so that I may believe what you say. Do not try to expose me to the world. I have no desire for the world; it is not part of my need. However, let your sincere advice to me be about religion and what is after death. That is the best of sincere advice. Allāh is able to invite us with you in obedience to Him. There is no good for those who are not in obedience to Allah. With Allāh is success. There is contentment in [believing in] Him. Peace be on you. Praise be to Allāh. May Allāh bless His Prophet, Muḥammad and His family, and grant them peace.

¹ ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, the Umayyad Caliph, died in 86 A.H. Al-Dhahabī, vol. IV, 246-49.

² The Ibādī sources agree that Sinān delivered the letter from ‘Abd al-Malik to ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibād. They do not quote the contents of ‘Abd al-Malik’s letter nor give any detail about Sinān.

³ ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān, who was among the first to become Muslim, was selected as caliph after ‘Umar in 24 A.H. and killed in 35 A.H. Ibn al-Athīr, *Asad al-Ghabah*, vol. III, 480-92.

⁴ Kafirūn is the plural of *kāfir*. The verb *kufir*, which means literally to cover up the truth refers to the rejection of any of the articles of faith. There are two aspects of *kufir*:

1. Major disbelief (*al-Kufr al-Akbar*); these exclude a person completely from the fold of Islam. There are five categories within this aspect of kufr.

a- *Kufr al-takdhīb*: This is to disbelief in the divine truth or to deny one of the six articles of faith (Allāh, His angels, His Messengers, His revealed Books, The Day of Resurrection, Divine Preordainment) *Kufr al-Ibā' wa al-Takabbur ma' al-Taṣdīq*: This means to reject with pride the necessity to submit to Allāh's order. See Qur'ān 2:34.

a- *Kufr al-Shakk wa al-Ẓan*: This implies doubt in the six articles of faith.

b- *Kufr I'rāḍ*: This constitutes turning away or deviating from the truth.

c- *Kufr al-Nifāq*: This refers to hypocrisy.

2. Minor disbelief (*al-Kufr al-Aṣghar*): This kind of disbelief does not exclude one from the fold of Islam. It is also called *Kufr al-Ni'mah*, which means that one is ungrateful to Allāh's favors and blessings and it is also called *Kufr dun-Kufr*.

⁵ Abū Bakr; his name is 'Abd Allāh b. 'Uthmān b. 'Amir b. Ka'b, the first man to become Muslim and the first caliph of the Muslims after the Prophet. He fought those who apostatised from Islam in the first year of his caliphate. Al-Qalḥātī vol. II, 195-197.

⁶ 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb; he embraced Islam in the fifth year of Prophethood; became Caliph after Abū Bakr; died 24 A.H. Ibn al-Athīr, *Asad al-Ghabah*, vol. IV, 53.

⁷ Jundab b. Junadah; one of the companions of the Prophet; known for his rejection of any form of saving, considering it to be hoarding. Al-'Asqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. VI, 335.

⁸ Muslim b. Yasār al-Juhanī. Ibid. vol., V, 416

⁹ It is narrated that a group of people from Kūfah wrote a letter to 'Uthmān advising him to stop appointing his relatives over the Muslims. Among this group were Ma'qal b. Qays al-Riyāḥī, Mālik b. Ḥabīb, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ṭufayl al-'Amirī, Ziyād b. Ḥaṣṣ al-Tamīmī, Yazīd b. Qays al-Arḥabī, Hajr b. 'Adī al-Kindī, 'Amr b. al-Ḥamiq al-Khuzā'ī, Zayd b. Ḥuṣn al-Ṭā'ī, and Ka'b b. 'Abdah al-Nahdī. (Ibn Dhī al-Ḥabkah). Though many of the group are not mentioned specifically by Ibn Ibāḍ an important name that is mentioned here is that of Zayd b. Ḥuṣn who was second in command of the Kharijites at Ṣiffīn. Ibn Shabbah also reports that Sa'īd b. al-'Aṣ the governor of Kūfah, wrote to 'Uthmān complaining that a group had beaten the leader of his guard (ṣaḥīb al-shurṭah). Sa'īd added to the list above (i.e. of those disrespecting the authority of 'Uthmān); Shurayḥ b. Awfā; Yazīd b. Mikhnaf; Ṣa'ṣa'ah b. Ṣuḥān; Ḥaqūṣ b. Zuhayr; Mālik b. al-Ḥārith; 'Amr b. Zurarah; Kamīl b. Ziyād; Ibn Shabbah, Abū Zayd 'Umar, *Kitāb Ta'rīkh al-Medina al-Munawwarah*, vol. III, 1141-2.

Al-Ṭabarī reported that the people of Kūfah wrote a letter to 'Uthmān asking him to expel more than ten people because they were causing trouble there. So 'Uthmān ordered that they be sent to Mu'āwiyah in Syria. On reaching Syria, they disputed with Mu'āwiyah. He consequently sent them, under 'Uthmān's command, to Medina. Among the group were Zayd b. Ṣuḥān, Jundab b. Zuhayr, Mālik b. al-Ḥārith al-Ashtar, Thabit b. Qays al-Nukha'ī, Kamīl b. Ziyād al-Nukha'ī, Jundab Ka'b al-Azdī, 'Amr b. al-Ḥamiq al-Khuzā'ī. These are the only eight names to be mentioned by al-Ṭabarī, but he indicates that they numbered more than ten. As such, it is possible that the those named by Ibn Ibāḍ could be among those expelled from Kūfah; Al-Ṭabarī, vol. IV, 371-326.

¹⁰ Ka'b b. 'Abdah al-Nahdī. (Ibn Dhī al-Ḥabkah) was exiled to al-Raī; he was punished with twenty lashes by Sa'd b. al-'Aṣ, the governor of Kūfah, by order of 'Uthmān. He was subsequently recalled to Medina and given the option to punish 'Uthmān in retaliation, but he chose to forgive him. Ibid., 1134.

¹¹ Jundab al-khayr al-Azdī: There is a dispute regarding whether he was a companion; he was killed in Ṣiffīn fighting with 'Alī. Al-'Asqalānī, *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. I, 124.

¹² Al-Walīd b. 'Uqbah b. Abī Mu'īt: 'Uthmān's half-brother - their mother was Arwā bint Kurayz and her mother was al-Bayḍā' bint 'Abd al-Muṭalib. 'Asqalānī, *al-Iṣābah fī Tamyiz al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. VI, 481-3.

¹³ He was the first to call people to remove ‘Uthmān. Ibn Shabbah, Abū Zayd ‘Umar, *Kitāb Ta’rīkh al-Medina al-Munawwarah*, edited by Fahīm Muhammad Shaltūt, vol. I, 1146.

¹⁴ He was one of the Kufans who laid siege to ‘Uthmān’s house; Al-Ṭabarī, vol. IV, 349-51.

¹⁵ Ibādī sources are confused regarding his name; sometime he is referred to as Ibn Dhurayḥ, and on other occasions as Ibn Dūwayj. They do not give any detail about him. He was called al-Aswad b. Sarī ‘Ḥimīar al-Tamīmī, died in 42. AH. al-Dhahabī, *Ta’rīkh al-Islam*, ed. al-Tadmurī, ‘Abd al-Salām, Beirut, 1989, vol (41-60 A.H), 23-4.

¹⁶ He was one of those who came to Medina in order to remove ‘Uthmān and among the group who also requested that ‘Uthmān remove Sa ‘īd b. al-‘Aṣ the governor of Kūfah; al-Ṭabarī, vol. IV, 331.

¹⁷ There is confusion regarding his name; he is also known as al-Tamīmī and al-‘Anbarī. Ibn al-Athīr states, “He is called ‘Āmir b. ‘Abd al-Qays.” He goes on to say that he went to ‘Uthmān on behalf of a group of Muslims in 34 A. H. and said to him, “Some Muslims looked into your deeds. They found that you have committed wrong acts, so fear Allāh.” ‘Uthmān said, “This man claims to be a scholar and he is talking to me about minor issues he does not know where is Allāh!” ‘Āmir replied, “I know that Allāh will punish you.” Ibn al-Athīr, ed. Tadmurī, Beirut, 1997, vol. II, 520-521.

¹⁸ He is called Madhur al-‘Anbarī, al-Barādī, op. cit., 159. No further detail is found about him except that he might have been among the groups mentioned above; see footnote 9.

¹⁹ Land for camels given in ṣadaqah: this was continued from the time of the Prophet who allotted land for the horses of jihād. It remained the same size under Abū Bakr, was enlarged under ‘Umar who incorporated al-Rabadhah, while ‘Uthmān included al-Sharif. Ibn Shabbah, vol. III, 840; Abū Bakr b. al-‘Arabī, *al-‘Awāṣim*, 85.

²⁰ At the time of the Prophet and Abū Bakr *‘Aṭā’* was divided equally amongst all of the Muslims. In 15 A.H. ‘Umar established the *dīwān* which meant that he paid the people who had fought in Badr the sum of five thousand dirhams each; those who fought at Ḥudaybiyah were given four thousands dirhams; those who fought at Ḥudaybiyah through to the war of *riddah* were given the sum of three thousand dirhams; and those who fought in the Battle of Qadisiyyah and the Syrians were given two thousand dirhams...etc. Al-Ṭabarī, vol. I, 452; al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, Cairo, 1956. vol. I-III, 459-552; Ibn Shabbah, op. cit., vol. III, 857.

²¹ It is reported that ‘Uthmān, when the people of Egypt came to him in resentment at some of his actions, explained his reasons to them. Amongst the issues were the collection of the Qur’ān the application of the ḥudūd, and protected land. ‘Uthmān then said: “I repent before Allāh and ask His forgiveness” (al-Ṭabarī, vol. V, 602). In another report, ‘Uthmān asked ‘Alī to discuss these matters with the rebels. They subsequently reached agreement over five matters: those who had been expelled were to be allowed to return; those from whom he had withheld were to receive the *fa’y* was to be saved; his division of public wealth was to be equitable; and only the trustworthy were to be appointed; Ibn Shabbah, vol. III, 1137-40.

²² ‘Uthmān denied any knowledge of the letter and swore to that. The rebels thought that it was written by Marwān and they asked ‘Uthmān to give them Marwān. ‘Alī asked the rebels either to prove their claim or to accept ‘Uthmān’s *yamīn*. The rebels asked ‘Uthmān to resign but he said: “I will not take off a garment with which Allāh has clad me.” Consequently, they laid siege to his house which resulted in his death; Al-Qalḥātī, vol. II, 163.

²³ Mu ‘āwiyah b. Abī Sufyān became Caliph after al-Hasan ceded to him in 41A.H; Al-Ṭabarī, vol. V, 323-25; Ibn Khayyāt, 203.

²⁴ The Battle of *Uḥud* was waged between the Muslims and the people of Mecca in the third year of Hijrah. The Muslims were defeated; 70 of them were killed and the Prophet was wounded. Ibn Hishām, *Sirat Ibn Hishām*, vol. III, 68-203. Uḥud is a mountain near Medina where the Battle took place. Al-Hamwī, Yāqūt. *Mu’jam al-Buldān*, vol. I, 135.

- ²⁵ The siege of 'Uthmān's house lasted forty days and ended in his death.
- ²⁶ A reference to the Battle of the Camel where Ṭalḥah and Zubayr were killed in 36 A.H.; Ibn Khayāt, 181-86.
- ²⁷ Al-Mukhtār b. 'Ubayd al-Thaqafī was one of the leaders of Thaqif, known for his bravery, eloquence, intelligence and has no piety. Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar 'Alām al-Nubalā*, vol I, 445-48. Al-Mukhtār send Ibrahim b. al-Ashtar to 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād, who was able to kill him. See al-Ṭabarī, vol. VI, 90.
- ²⁸ 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād b. Abyah, was appointed as governor of Baṣrah in 22 A.H. He aroused hatred because he killed al-Husayn b. 'Alī in 67 A.H. al-Dhahabī, vol. III, 543.
- ²⁹ Muṣ'ab Ibn al-Zubayr b. al-'Awwam was appointed governor of Baṣrah by his brother 'Abd Allāh and was subsequently able to kill al-Mukhtār; Al-Ṭabarī, op cit., vol. VI, 118.
- ³⁰ It is not clear why Muṣ'ab was called 'the Dreadful'. It seems that the Khārijites resented and denounced his killing of the wife of Al-Mukhtār b. 'Ubayd al-Thaqafī. If this report is true this may have earned him that appellation.; Al-Mubarrad, al-Kāmil, vol. III, 246.
- ³¹ Al-Ḥunīf b. al-Sajaf al-Tamīmī, the leader of the army sent from Baṣrah to Medina to fight Ibn Duljah in 65. A.H.; Al-Ṭabarī, vol. V, 611-12; Ibn al-'Athīr, vol. III, 273-74.
- ³² His name is Ḥubaysh b. Duljah al-Qaīnī. He was sent by Marwān b. al-Ḥakam to Medina to take it from Ibn al-Zubayr's followers; Al-Ṭabarī, vol. V, 611-12; Ibn al-'Athīr, vol. III, 273-74.
- ³³ This battle occurred in 65. A. H. when Marwān b. al-Ḥakam sent an army led by Ḥubaysh b. Duljah al-Qaīnī to Medina, which was under the authority of Ibn al-Zubayr. The governor of Medina fled the city. So al-Ḥārith b. Rabī'ah the governor of Baṣrah for Ibn al-Zubayr sent an army led by Al-Ḥunīf b. al-Sajaf al-Tamīmī to Ḥubaysh. He joined forces with an army sent by 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr. They were able to defeat and kill Ḥubaysh b. Duljah. *Ibid*; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashraf*, IV/I, ed. Iḥsān 'Abbās, Beirut, 1979, 353.
- ³⁴ Muslim b. 'Uqbah laid siege to Medina at the time of Yazīd b. Mu'āwiyah. When the people of Medina revolted against the Umayyads in 63 A.H. he defeated them. Al-Qalḥātī, vol. II, 258. ; Ibn al-'Athīr, vol. III, 211-23.
- ³⁵ 'Abd Allāh b. Zubayr b. al-'Awwam: He defeated the Syrians at Mecca in 64 A.H. because the army heard that Yazīd had died; Ibn Khayāt, 249-56.
- ³⁶ Pharaoh is mentioned in the Qur'ān 64 times as an example of tyranny and injustice. Qur'ān 2:79.
- ³⁷ See Qur'ān 2:258.
- ³⁸ Al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Tālib: He was selected to be caliph after his father, but after seven months and seven days he agreed to step down for Mu'āwiyah. When Mu'āwiyah died, his son became caliph. This was considered a clear sign by the Ibādī that al-Ḥasan had been deceived by Mu'āwiyah, according to the Ibādī; Ibn Khayāt, 203; Al-Qalḥātī, vol. II, 258.
- ³⁹ Ziyād b. Abīah was known as Ibn Summayyah because his father was not known. This could also be refer to 'Ammār b. Yāṣir who was killed by Mu'āwiyah's army at Ṣiffīn. The Ibādīs regard the killing of 'Ammār as a sign of the tyrant group is referred to when the Prophet said: "He ['Ammār] will be killed by the group who rebelled. That he was killed by Mu'āwiyah if he only committed the sin of killing 'Ammār it is enough for him to be consider unjust" *Idem*.
- ⁴⁰ Yazīd b. Mu'āwiyah b. Abī Sufyan the second Umayyad caliph appointed in 60 A.H.; Ibn Khayāt, 234. The Ibādīs are not alone in accusing Yazīd. However, Kremer says about the later accusations, "In darkest colours the native writers describe the second Caliph Yazīd I. Much of it evidently is pure

exaggeration.” Kremer, *The Orient Under the Caliphs*, trans. S. Khuda Bukksh, Philadelphia, 1977, 163.

⁴¹ The important point that emerges is that they regard all of the Khārijite revolts as acceptable in terms of the individual’s choice to fight against tyranny and the corruption of Islam. They regard this form of *khurūj* as legitimate and in no way to be moving outside Islam. These revolts were carried out by “sincere Muslim”; Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *Sirah*, vol. II, 307.

⁴² For Ibn Ibāḍ, and Ibāḍīs after him, the Khārijite movement as a movement of extremists only began with Nāfi’ b. al-Azraq. It was he who divided the movement of the sincere Muslims, deviated from their agenda and denounced those who did not revolt with him. Ibn al-Azraq introduced discord and caused the first division among the sincere Muslims, as the Ibāḍīs like to call them. The hostility of the Ibāḍīs to this group is further demonstrated by the later Ibāḍī accusation that these groups had gone beyond *kufr-al-ni ‘mah*; Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *Sirah*, vol. II, 308.

⁴³ The Ibāḍīs consider Abū Bakr and ‘Umar to be the only rightly guided Caliphs.

CHAPTER FIVE

IBN IBĀḌ AND HIS LETTER TO ‘ABD AL-MALIK

Before examining the few details in Ibāḍī sources on Ibn Ibāḍ’s life and role in the Ibāḍī movement, it is necessary to examine arguments which have been put forward recently concerning the existence of Ibn Ibāḍ and the authenticity of his letters.

Until Cook wrote his book, *Early Muslim Dogma*, there had been a consensus among scholars that Ibn Ibāḍ’s two letters to ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān were genuine and that the first letter was written in 75 or 76 A.H.¹ As Cook rightly points out, the second letter is about the Shī‘ah and therefore hardly relevant to a correspondence between Ibn Ibāḍ, a leader of a “Khārijite” group, and ‘Abd al-Malik. He also points out that the second letter lacked an address to the recipient and that the only real evidence for it being to ‘Abd al-Malik was the fact that the late writer Sirḥan b. Sa‘īd al-Azkawī, who reported it, had described it as a letter to ‘Abd al-Malik. This would seem to be a reasonable argument. The letter clearly was not written to ‘Abd al-Malik. As its contents are concerned with an attack on the Shī‘ī beliefs,² it is not of specific interest to this thesis.

The first letter, by contrast is of importance, together with a passage in al-Ṭabarī’s *Ta’rīkh*, in showing early Ibāḍī views. However, Cook is at pains to demonstrate that this letter is of later date than was previously thought. Cook, of course, has a

vested interest in that this is unsurprising, since the letter is replete with quotations from the Qur'ān. If it were genuine, it would substantially undermine the claims of fabrications which Cook and Crone make in the work, *Hagarism*.³

The process by which Cook seeks to undermine the authenticity is simple. He first rightly points out that the dating 76 A.H. is dependent on the view that Ibn Ibāḍ is writing as a result of the Ṣufrite rebellion in that year.⁴ This is very unconvincing and Cook's argument seems valid because the letter of Ibn Ibāḍ did not refer to that and also the Ibādī had split with Ṣufrite in 63.A.H. It would not be relevant for Ibn Ibāḍ to Write about the Ṣufrite.

His next argument is that the tone of the letter is such that it could not possibly have been written to the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik. To this he adds that to describe the Caliph as "being in obedience to his predecessors and joining them in disobedience to Allāh" would not be an appropriate way to describe 'Abd al-Malik.⁵ This is totally unconvincing. 'Abd al-Malik was, in fact, following 'Uthmān and his successors among the Umayyads. Finally, Cook argues that the words "Do not ask about Mu'āwiyah, his conduct and his actions, for we lived at the same time and we saw his conduct and his practice towards the people," could not have been addressed to 'Abd al-Malik, for he was already a young man at that time and was not in need of information about Mu'āwiyah.⁶ This completely misses the point of the words. It is clear from the letter that 'Abd al-Malik has already questioned Ibn Ibāḍ in his letter

about Mu'āwiyah's success and its demonstrating that Allāh supported him. Ibn Ibāḍ was merely replying to the effect that he was there too and had seen how Mu'āwiyah had really acted. Returning to the tone of the letter, Cook suggests that it is patronising in giving a younger man information about his duty. He notes that the Ibāḍīs do have two letters written by Jābir b. Zayd to 'Abd al-Malik b. al-Muhallab. He suggests that the latter man is the real recipient of the letter.⁷

He regrets that he was unable to read these letters as this may have helped his case. However, it is quite clear from these two letters and the other letters of Jābir that they are very different from Ibn Ibāḍ's letter. The first letter congratulates 'Abd Malik b. al-Muhallab on his success, saying: "Allāh has shown joy to you and to us." It hopes that "Allāh will bring down your enemy."⁸ In both cases the "you" is in the plural. It almost certainly refers to the whole family of al-Muhallab, including 'Abd al-Malik, the member of which escaped from prison and were given protection by Sulaymān b. 'Abd al-Malik in 90 A.H.⁹ The wish for their "enemy" to be brought down is almost certainly a reference to al-Ḥajjāj. Therefore, the letter is almost certainly written shortly after 'Abd al-Malik's and the rest of his family's escape from prison. The contents of the letters are otherwise answers to problems of Islamic law. Jābir protests that he is only a student of other scholars in response to 'Abd al-Malik's praise of him as an outstanding scholar. The other feature of the first letter is the need for both men to be cautious in the face of enemies and Jābir suggests that the authorities are anxious to find a pretext to make a move against him.¹⁰ The first

part of the second letter is missing and the remaining portion is only concerned with legal problems.¹¹ From this, it seems highly unlikely that Jābir would write a letter to ‘Abd al-Malik b. Muhallab like that written by Ibn Ibāḍ to ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān.

Cook then turns his to the question of Ibn Ibāḍ and argues that he did not exist. Cook’s evidence consists of the fact that three of the Khārijites present at the siege of Mecca with Ibn al-Zubayr had names linked with colours, Ibn Azraq, Ibn Ṣaffār and Ibn Ibāḍ. To argue for this, Cook has to make *ibāḍ* a corruption of *abyaḍ*, though he does acknowledge in a footnote that Ibāḍ is an Arabic word which means camels and has nothing to do with *abyaḍ*.¹² His next argument is that Ibn Ibāḍ plays no role in Ibāḍī law and *ḥadīth*. The third argument is that the earliest reference by the Ibāḍiyyah to themselves comes in a third century work. Ibn Ḥazm says that Ibn Ibāḍ was unknown to the Ibāḍīs in Spain, who were Nukkārites, who split from other Ibāḍīs in the middle of the second century. Thus Cook maintains that Ibn Ibāḍ is a late second century invented name.¹³

In effect, the evidence from Ibn Ḥazm is based on reported conversations with people from a minor sub-group of the Ibāḍī movement, who might also be practising *taqiyyah*. Cook also argues that there are no references to a lost work by Abū Sufyān, which is the basic source for Ibāḍī accounts of the Baṣran period. On this basis he says that “the literally colourful role of Ibn Ibāḍ in the foundation of the sect is a

fiction invented by non-Ibāḍīs, only tardily and clumsily received into the Ibāḍī tradition.”¹⁴

Finally, Cook points out that some of the quotations from the Qur’ān suggest an open hostility and urge fighting against the Imam of error and taking a stand against concealment of religious belief. However, while the first quotation is valid, the second one is tendentious. What is quoted, in fact, is: “Those who conceal the proofs and guidance which Allāh has revealed after what we have explained to the people, those are they whom Allāh curses and the cursers curse except those who repent, let them put them right and make them clear. I will relent against those. I am the One who relents, the Compassionate.”(2:195) This verse hardly refers to a denial of concealment of one’s beliefs in the face of hostile authorities. It is a justification for the open way Ibn Ibāḍ has spoken about the points raised by ‘Abd al-Malik.

Cook, then, proceeds to suggest that the letter has been forged by militant Ibāḍīs in the course of an unidentified dispute about quietism and militancy in late Umayyad Baṣrah, where it had first been passed as a letter of Jābir b. Zayd and was later attributed to Ibn Ibāḍ.¹⁵ In this way, the letter ceases to be a threat to the views which Cook expresses in *Hagarism*.

Cook’s suspicions about Ibn Ibāḍ are in some ways justifiable. As will be seen, he does appear to be quite a mysterious figure. However, Cook’s suggestions of how he came to exist require the suspension of disbelief. At some point in the middle of the

second century, certain Muslims decided to identify the beliefs of a group whom they opposed with a man whom they invented. They then proceeded to give him the name ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibād and fabricated accounts of him being present at the siege of Mecca in 64 A.H. in support of Ibn al-Zubayr with other Khārijites. They then fabricated a dispute he had with ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣaffār, another fabricated character(!) in which they set out their differences with Ibn al-Azraq and each other. In the course of this dispute Ibn Ibād outlines some of the key points, on which he and the people who hold his ideas base their views.

The first mention of Ibn Ibād’s appearance in Mecca is recorded by al-Ṭabarī (d. 310 A.H.) who took it from Ibn al-Kalbī (d. 204 A.H.), who, in turn, cites Abū Mikhnaḥ (d. 157 A.H.).¹⁶ Al-Ṭabarī has been known to make interpolations and comments in his material and also sometimes to omit matters from the text. Otherwise, he is a very reliable transmitter of source material. His own authority, Ibn al-Kalbī, sometimes combines accounts which are found separately in other accounts but does not appear to have otherwise tampered with his material. Those of his accounts from Abū Mikhnaḥ, when compared with other sources of Abū Mikhnaḥ, show him to be a reliable reporter. Abū Mikhnaḥ is a historian with a particular interest in events in Iraq. He was a prodigious recorder of accounts from eye-witnesses or people who reported from eye-witnesses. His authority in this case is Abū ‘Alqamah al-Khath‘amī, who received his report from Qabīṣah b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Quḥāfī.¹⁷ Bearing in mind that Abū Mikhnaḥ died in 157, this puts “the invention” of Ibn Ibād into the mouth of a person sympathetic with the Khārijites which could be no later

than the turn of the first century. In fact, it brings us much closer to the time Ibn Ibāḍ is reported to have lived. It should also be noted that the report gives not just the three names mentioned by Cook but many others whose names occur in other accounts of the Khārijites. Also, the name of ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣaffār is given as that and not the more unusual variant used by Cook - b. Aṣfar,¹⁸ which fits so neatly into his colour allegation, *azraq*, *asfar* and *abyaḍ*. The report describes how the various leaders dissociate themselves from Ibn al-Zubayr after his refusal to condemn ‘Uthmān and return home to Baṣrah and Yamāmah.

The second report about the dispute between the three “Kharijite” leaders, Nafi‘ b. al-Azraq, ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣaffār and ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ, is reported by Abū Mikhnaḥ on the authority of Abū al-Muthannā, whose informant was an unknown member of the Khārijites in Baṣrah.¹⁹ Again we are looking at a report which could have been “fabricated” no later than the beginning of the first century A.H., and again the reporter is a man of Khārijite sympathies. The report states: They (the Khārijites) met together. The ordinary men (*‘āmmah*) among them said: “What if we came out [in revolt], for there has been a period of time for us since our companions came out [in revolt]. Then our scholars would remain in the world (*arḍ*) and they would be lights to the people summoning them to the [true] religion while people of piety and struggle (*ijtihād*) would go out to meet the Lord. They would be martyrs who would receive the reward of being alive with Allāh.”²⁰

At this Nāfi' b. al-Azraq is appointed as their leader and he leads three hundred men out in revolt. There is no report of any immediate fighting in Baṣrah apart from some Khārijites breaking out of jail. The activity seems to come from those opposed to the Khārijites, who are said to have pursued and terrified the Khārijites who remained in Baṣrah so that those who had remained went and joined Ibn al-Azraq. Among those who continued to stay in Baṣrah were 'Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ and 'Abd Allāh b. Ṣaffār.²¹

In a speech to his followers, Ibn al-Azraq lays out his policy. He quotes the Qur'ān as a basis for it: "A renunciation/dissociation (*barā'ah*) by Allāh and His Messenger of those of the polytheists (*mushrikīn*) with whom you had made a covenant" (9:1). To this, he adds another quotation: "Do not marry polytheist women until they become believers." (2:220). The policy is then elaborated. Allāh has prohibited association (*walāyah*) with the polytheists, living among them, accepting their testimony, eating animals slaughtered by them, accepting knowledge about religion from them, marrying them and inheriting from them. Allāh also requires that they acknowledge this and that it is their duty to make this religion known to those from whom they have withdrawn (*kharaja*). What emerges from this is the demand for complete separation from other Muslims who are designated as polytheists. It would imply that the policy of quiescence (*qu'ūd*) was no longer acceptable. This policy Ibn al-Azraq perhaps elaborated in letters he sent to Ibn Ṣaffār and Ibn Ibāḍ. Their reaction to this letter, and especially Ibn Ibāḍ's reaction, is of such great interest that

it is worth giving the translation of Ibn Ibāḍ's statement, particularly as Hawting's translation has completely missed the point.²² What Ibn Ibāḍ says is

“May Allāh destroy him. In any view which he held, Nafi‘ had spoken the truth [before]. If the people (*qawm*) were polytheists (*mushrikīn*), he would have been the most correct of the people in [his] judgement about what he is advising and his practice (*sīrah*) would be like the practice of the Prophet towards the polytheists. However, he has lied and we declare [him] to be a liar in what he is saying. The people are unbelievers (*kuffār*) in (or those who show ingratitude to) the favours (*ni‘am*) and laws [of Allāh]. They are innocent (*burra*) of polytheism (*shirk*). Only their blood is permitted to us, anything else in terms of their property is forbidden to us.” At this Ibn Ṣaffār said: “May Allāh dissociate Himself from you, you have fallen short. May Allāh dissociate Himself from Ibn al-Azraq, he has gone to extremes. May Allāh dissociate Himself from both of you.”²³

From this, it appears that Ibn Ibāḍ refuses to classify other Muslims as polytheists. The furthest that he will go is to describe them as *kuffār bi-al-ni‘am wa-al-aḥkām*, although he does allow the possibility of making war against them. The Qur’ān refers to *kufṛ* in a variety of ways. This type of *kufṛ* is the type which rejects the favours that Allāh has granted Muslims with His laws and fails to obey those laws. The breach with Ibn Ṣaffār is concerned with this definition. Ibn Ṣaffār, like Ibn al-Azraq, regards them as polytheists. Where both Ibn Ibāḍ and Ibn Ṣaffār disagree with Ibn al-Azraq is in opposing the latter's insistence on the necessity of coming out in revolt. Both allow the legitimacy of not coming out in revolt (*qu‘ūd*), although both concede that revolt may occur and would be legitimate action.

Before analysing Ibn Ibāḍ's letter, it would be appropriate to discuss what the Ibāḍī sources have to say about Ibn Ibāḍ. In actual fact, Ibāḍī sources add little to the information given to us by other sources. His name is ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ and from

the clan of Ṣārim of the tribe of Tamīm. The dates of his birth and death are unknown.²⁴ He is classified as one of the Successors of the Companions of the Prophet. However, this information is really a gloss on the information already reported by other sources. There is a report that when Nāfi' b. al-Azraq came out in revolt, he had contemplated joining him but decided against that.²⁵ This would have been before Ibn al-Azraq made his views clear. It is also claimed that he had been a teacher of such men as Abū 'Ubaydah.²⁶ Again this information may have been a deduction made on the basis of him being a contemporary of Jābir b. Zayd. It is claimed that he was a theologian²⁷ but again this information may also be a gloss on the information contained in the historical accounts. There are firm reports that in all his activities Ibn Ibāḍ was acting in accordance with the orders of Jābir b. Zayd, who was the real leader of the movement.²⁸ The paucity of facts about Ibn Ibāḍ explains Cook's doubts about his existence.

The three historical events in which we meet Ibn Ibāḍ are three occasions when there is a need for a general statement to the Ibāḍīs and other Muslims as to what the Ibāḍī position was.

In the first place, there was the need to emphasise the duty to defend Mecca from violation by the Umayyads. It also an opportunity to try to persuade Ibn al-Zubayr to adopt a more favourable attitude towards Khārijites. In this case, he merely had to condemn 'Uthmān. As far as 'Alī was concerned, the fact that Ibn al-Zubayr had not

opposed 'Alī from the start of his caliphate meant that he would only have to make minor alterations to his views. As for the Umayyads, Ibn al-Zubayr was already in revolt against them and calling for a consultative council (*shūrā*) to decide who the caliph should be. This probably pleased the Khārijites as they might have hoped that it would give them an opportunity to have a real influence over Muslim government if Ibn al-Zubayr's revolt was successful.

After the Umayyads had withdrawn from the siege of Mecca, Ibn al-Zubayr failed the Khārijites on the very first count since he refused to condemn 'Uthmān. Without this condemnation, there could be no real active co-operation between the two parties, and the Khārijite leaders, including Ibn Ibāḍ, withdrew.

The second occasion was another time when there needed to be a public statement to the Ibāḍīs about their differences with Ibn al-Azraq and also to the other Muslims about the fact that the Ibāḍīs were not extremists like the Azāriqah and were willing to live peacefully among the other Muslims. Again Ibn Ibāḍ was the spokesman for this.

The final occasion was when 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān wanted to address the Ibāḍī community. He had no identifiable leader to address except Ibn Ibāḍ. Ibn Ibāḍ's reply is addressed in fact to both 'Abd al-Malik and the Ibāḍī community to make clear the Ibāḍī position.

There is silence from Ibn Ibāḍ when Ibn al-Ash‘ath’s revolt against Hajjāj is joined by the Ibāḍīs. There could be two reasons for this. It is possible that Ibn Ibāḍ was dead. Alternatively, the failure of the revolt and the arrest of leading Ibāḍīs such as Abū ‘Ubaydah, Ja‘far b. Sammāk and Dumām b. al-Sā’ib, together with the tight grip al-Hajjāj had on Baṣrah, made it too dangerous for a public statement to be made.²⁹

It seems then that Ibn Ibāḍ was a public spokesman for the Ibāḍīs when issues had to be addressed. It is probable that Ibn Ibāḍ represented Jābir. It is his statements which draw attention to himself and divert attention away from Jābir b. Zayd, the real leader of the movement. As a result of these public statements, the movement was associated with him by outsiders and they gave his name to the movement.

From Ibn Ibāḍ’s letter certain points arise which indicate some of the contents of ‘Abd al-Malik’s letter.

1. ‘Abd al-Malik mentioned that he would only accept arguments from Ibn Ibāḍ drawn from the Qur’ān.
2. ‘Abd al-Malik had argued that Mu‘āwiyah’s success in seeking vengeance for the blood of ‘Uthmān was due to the support of Allāh.
3. ‘Abd al-Malik had described the Khārijites as exceeding the limits of Islam.
3. ‘Abd al-Malik had asked Ibn Ibāḍ for advice, (possibly about how they could effectively co-operate against the Azāriqah.)

4. 'Abd al-Malik had urged Ibn Ibāḍ to answer his letter.
5. 'Abd al-Malik had made an offer to Ibn Ibāḍ. (It is impossible to know the nature of this offer but it could have been a position of authority if there were co-operation between the two parties.)

Although Ibn Ibāḍ's letter is full of quotations from the Qur'ān, in his reply he also mentions that "the order of Allāh and the Sunnah of the Prophet" should be followed. He points out that the Prophet acted according to "the order of Allāh." He goes on to stress that when Abū Bakr became caliph, he followed the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of the Prophet, but he adds: "None of the Muslims withdrew from him in any law which he made or division [of wealth] which he made until he died." This suggests that there were developments of practice made by Abū Bakr based on the Qur'ān and the Sunnah which were acceptable to the Muslims and became part of the established practice of Islam. This idea is strengthened by Ibn Ibāḍ's claim that 'Umar "followed the path of those who had gone before him," that is of the Prophet and Abū Bakr. Thus there is an additional practice to be followed as well as that of the Qur'ān. One of the criticisms of 'Uthmān is that "he introduced matters by which his two predecessors had not acted before him," in other words, he violated the practice established by Abū Bakr and 'Umar with the consent of the believers. Ibn Ibāḍ reinforces this view by recording: "When the Muslims saw what 'Uthmān had done, they came to him and spoke to him and mentioned the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of those believers who were before him." Ibn Ibāḍ is clearly pointing out to 'Abd al-Malik that his view of Islam involves not only the Book of Allāh and the

Sunnah of the Prophet but also the Sunnah of Abū Bakr and 'Umar. The latter also has a major role to play in the conduct of Islamic affairs and this conduct is given its sanction by being in accord with the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of the Prophet together with the consent of those believers who were contemporaries with the Prophet. From the indications within the text of the letter, it would seem that the principal practices of Abū Bakr and 'Umar were concerned with the distribution of *fa'y*, the income earned from the conquered lands, and the system of payment introduced by 'Umar known as *dīwān*.

There are, however, no quotations of the words of Abū Bakr and 'Umar, just as there are no quotations of *ḥadīth* in support of the Sunnah of the Prophet. Both Sunnahs seem to be regarded as established practices which do not need the support of reports in the form of *ḥadīth*. On the other hand, there are extensive quotations from the Qur'ān and Ibn Ibāḍ seeks to demonstrate that by violating the precepts of the Qur'ān, 'Uthmān merits the Qur'ānic description of being one of those who are guilty of *kufṛ*. Thus, killing him was a justifiable act.

The main accusations made against 'Uthmān in the letter seem to be the principal ones made by later Ibāḍīs against 'Uthmān, so the letter may be their main source, though, of course, many of them have been recorded in historical texts.

It is noticeable that Ibn Ibāḍ accuses 'Uthmān of *kufṛ*, not *shirk*. He does not distinguish between kinds of *kufṛ* in the letter, nor does he refer to *kufṛ bi-al-ni'am*,

as he did in his statement about Ibn Azraq's views. However, this letter is not the place for a theological discussion which was concerned with an internal Khārijite dispute.

The letter goes out of its way to justify all previous Khārijite actions in answer to 'Abd al-Mallik's third point, but implicit in it is the view that all these actions were brought about by the aggressive actions of rulers who were in error. 'Uthmān is not attacked until he makes the situation impossible. The main action of the Khārijites has otherwise been to withdraw from the community. This, according to Ibādī doctrine, is a perfectly legitimate thing to do. However, it must have been common knowledge that the quiescent group in Baṣrah were prepared to live within the community of other Muslims and it was only the violence of the other Muslims that might cause them to withdraw. It is this that Ibn Ibād is warning 'Abd al-Malik against. As a spokesman, Ibn Ibād has to appear to be trying to convince 'Abd al-Malik to adopt his views. However, at a more implicit level, he may be seeking to influence policy so that the quiescent group may live in peace with the rest of the community. His forthright condemnation of the Azāriqah indicates not only doctrinal differences but differences with regard to the possibility of living at peace within the community. However, if 'Abd al-Malik had asked for co-operation against the Azāriqah, as suggested in point 4, Ibn Ibād was only co-operating to the extent of condemning them.

As far as the claim that Allāh's support is evident in Mu'āwiyah's success in seeking revenge for the blood of 'Uthmān this argument is effectively dismissed by Ibn Ibāḍ when he points out how different people had succeeded in battles at different times. These victories had little to do with the support of Allāh. Nonetheless the letter does seem to have a determinist. Actions, even wrong actions, are done "as Allāh wished." The course of history, therefore, is not a justification for the rightness of a cause. Things happen as Allāh wishes and the reward for goodness is ultimately in the next life. Ibn Ibāḍ states this clearly when he rejects 'Abd al-Malik's probable offer of advancement: "I have no desire for the world; it is not part of my need."

The point raised in Ibn Ibāḍ's letter about there being criticism from some of the Umayyads about the actions of Mu'āwiyah and Yazīd does not seem to occur clearly in the historical texts. However, there are some indications of disagreement by some of the Umayyads. Al-Walīd b. 'Utbah, the governor of Medina, was very reluctant to make al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī pledge allegiance to Yazīd on the death of Mu'āwiyah.³⁰ The women of Yazīd's household wept at what happened to al-Ḥusayn's family in the aftermath of Karbalā.³¹ 'Amr b. Uthmān refused to give information about the dispositions of the people of Medina to Yazīd's general, Muslim b. 'Uqbah, when he was released and gave a pledge not to do so. However, 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān broke his pledge and gave the information to Muslim b. 'Uqbah so that he was able to use this with advantage to defeat the Medinans at the Battle of Ḥarraḥ in 63 A.H.³²

In his letter, Ibn Ibāḍ, as the spokesman for the movement that later adopted his name, set out that movement's approval of the killing of 'Uthmān because of crimes which amounted to *kufṛ*. Nonetheless, the Khārijites, whom he justifies, are merely men who act with integrity and do not associate with those who do not. He does not justify the policy of quiescence but takes it as understood. His denunciation of the Azāriqah would seem to involve both doctrines and policies. As the public spokesman, he sets out the views for public consumption. It is the leader, Jābir who sets the example in quiescence in his encouragement of secrecy (*kitmān*) and *taqiyyah*.

¹Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, Cambridge, 1980, 58.

-
- ² *Ibid.*, 53-5.
- ³ P. Crone & M. Cook, *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World*, Cambridge, 1977.
- ⁴ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 58.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, 60-1.
- ⁶ *Idem.*
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, 63.
- ⁸ *Rasā'il Jābir b. Zayd*, 37.
- ⁹ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 63.
- ¹⁰ *Rasā'il Jābir b. Zayd*, 40.
- ¹¹ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 64.
- ¹² *Idem.*
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 64-5.
- ¹⁴ *Idem.*
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 64-7.
- ¹⁶ Al-Ṭabarī, vol. II, 515-7.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 517.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 517-519.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.* II, 517.
- ²⁰ *Idem.*
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, II, 518.
- ²² *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, XX, trans. G. R. Hawting, New York, 1989, 104.
- ²³ Al-Ṭabarī, vol. II, 519.
- ²⁴ Al-Dirjīnī, vol. II, 214.
- ²⁵ Abū Al-Mu'athir, vol. II, 308, 310.
- ²⁶ Al-Qalhātī, vol. I, 178; Khalayfat, 'Awaḍ, Nashat al-Ibāḍiyyah, Amman, 1978, 83.
- ²⁷ Al-Dirjīnī, vol. II, 214.
- ²⁸ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 73.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 78.
- ³⁰ Al-Ṭabarī, vol. II, 410-411.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, vol. II, 218-219.
- ³² *Idem.*

CHAPTER SIX

THE CONTRIBUTION OF ABŪ 'UAYDAH AND AL-RABĪ'

B. ḤABĪB

Abū 'Ubaydah

Abū 'Ubaydah was steeped in the Ibādī movement. He was a *mawlā* of 'Urwah b. Udayyah, who had been the first to reject the arbitration, had fought against 'Alī at al-Nahrawān and was killed by 'Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād in Baṣrah. 'Urwah was the brother of Abū Bilāl. Abū 'Ubaydah studied law and traditions under Jābir b. Zayd and under Jābir's students Ja'far b. Sammāk, Ṣuḥār al-'Ubdī and Ḍumām b. al-Sā'ib.¹ While Jābir was in charge of the movement, Abū 'Ubaydah seems to have played a more openly active role. It seems that the Ibādīs felt that Ibn al-Ash'ath's revolt against the Umayyads offered them an opportunity of breaking free from Umayyad oppression just as earlier they had at first thought that Ibn al-Zubayr's revolt had presented them with a similar opportunity. Then Jābir b. Zayd had entrusted the leadership of the group who joined Ibn al-Zubayr to Ibn Ibād. On this occasion, Abū 'Ubaydah and two of his teachers, Ja'far b. Sammāk and Ḍumām b. Sā'ib, seem to have functioned as leaders. On the failure of the revolt, al-Ḥajjāj had all three of them imprisoned. Abū 'Ubaydah was in prison for a long time and was not released until 95.A.H. By this time Jābir was dead and Abū 'Ubaydah emerged as the leader of the movement. Although under Jābir secrecy plays an important part

in the movement, Abū ‘Ubaydah seems to have widened the basis of the movement’s activities.

Abū ‘Ubaydah emphasised the importance of traditions for the Ibāḍī movement, thus extending the work of Jābir b. Zayd. He extended the link with early Companions such as ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās, ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd and ‘Abd Allāh b. Sallām.²

However, he stressed that such *ḥadīth* must be reported on the authority of shaykhs of the Ibāḍī movement. Thus, he helped to build a core of traditions based on Jābir’s initial work which were acceptable to the Ibāḍīs and could be used in the development of Ibāḍī law. In this connection, he was more rigid than Jābir. Where the latter had allowed an Ibāḍī woman to marry a non-Ibāḍī, Abū ‘Ubaydah had insisted that, although this was technically permissible, it should not be allowed. In this, he would seem to have been trying to bring about close cohesion within the Ibāḍī movement and separation from outsiders. This policy also seems to have been followed at the political and revolutionary level. After the failure of their policy to seek an accommodation with the rebellions against the Umayyads by Ibn al-Zubayr and Ibn al-Ash‘ath and perhaps also as a result of the long incarceration of Abū ‘Ubaydah, Ja‘far b. Sammāk and Ḍumām b. al-Sā‘ib, the Ibāḍīs do not appear to have contemplated any revolutionary activity in Iraq and the heartland of the Umayyad Empire. In fact, Abū ‘Ubaydah seems to have completely reversed Jābir’s policy of having some association with the Umayyad authorities. He discouraged all contacts with these authorities, emphasising that the Ibāḍīs were not to become involved with them in any way

Abū ‘Ubaydah, together with his own former teachers, played an important role in training Ibādī scholars in Baṣrah and making Baṣrah a centre for Ibādī views. Under Jābir, the Ibādīs used to meet together and Jābir seems to have trained men in the doctrines and beliefs of the movement. These meetings were held in secret. It has been reported that during the time of Ziyād and ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād, the Ibādīs used to attend meetings wearing women’s garments to conceal the nature of their activities from the authorities.³ However, it was under the leadership of Abū ‘Ubaydah that these meetings become more systematised. He instituted three different types of meeting:⁴ the general meeting (*majlis al-‘āmmah*), the meeting for students (*majlis ḥamalt al-‘ilm*) and the meeting of scholars (*majlis al-mashāyikh*)

1. The general gatherings (*majalis ‘ammah*) were open to any Ibādī. These meetings were held in one of the *shaykh*’s houses where Ibādīs received lessons in doctrine (*‘aqīdah*), and instructions from the scholars. These *majālis* were run by one of the leading Ibādī scholars ‘Abd al-Malik al-Ṭawīl.⁵ Al-Darjīnī⁶ mentioned that “‘Abd al-Malik Ṭawīl’s⁷ house used to be a meeting place for the Ibādīs. The neighbours used to hear their noise.”⁸ These meetings were sometimes investigated by the authorities. However, the Ibādīs used to leave people on guard outside, and when these guards sensed danger they told the groups to run away or to hide in the basement.⁹

2. The gatherings for students (*majlis ḥamalāt al-‘ilm*) were designed for students from different parts of the Muslim world and were taught by Abū ‘Ubaydah himself. The school was established in the basement of his house, and it was only known to the students and the Ibāḍī scholars. From this school many famous Ibāḍī scholars graduated. Abū ‘Ubaydah encouraged students from places where he hoped the Ibāḍī mission would be spread. It appears that the Ibāḍīs at this time were planning to spread their mission to different places in the Muslim world. Abū ‘Ubaydah always used to leave a guard outside his house while he was teaching, with a chain connected between the guard on the outside and the people inside. When the guard sensed danger, he shook the chain to warn them so that they could stop their lesson.¹⁰

3. The gatherings of scholars (*majlis al-mashāyikh*) were attended only by the leaders of the movement. These were conducted in secret by the secret Imam and the members were scholars. It is stated that these scholars attended these meetings at night and did not bring any youth with them.¹¹ These gatherings were designed especially for the scholars who planned the policies of the movement, and exchanged opinions about their moves. These were like an executive committee, which set policies for the group at different levels and in different situations and decided how to conduct the internal affairs of the Ibāḍī movement.

These three gatherings, in their form as established by Abū ‘Ubaydah, were important instruments in the development of the Ibāḍī movement. Within the *majlis al-‘āmmah*, the Ibāḍīs in Baṣrah could keep in close touch with each other and

maintain their faith. The *majlis al-mashāyikh* served as a form of consultative committee (*shūrā*) which was to become a central concept in Ibādī political thought. However, the most significant of the three at that time was the *majlis ḥamalat al-‘ilm*, which under Abū ‘Ubaydah served as a training ground to spread the views of the movement and, where conditions were right, served to train leaders of revolutions in favour of the Ibādī movement.

Several of the students of Abū ‘Ubaydah played an important role in the extension of Ibādī influence. Among these was a student from Ḥaḍramawt, ‘Abd Allāh b. Yaḥyā al-Kindī, who led the Ibādī revolution in Ḥaḍramawt and Yemen in 128 A.H and become Imam there. Abū ‘Ubaydah sent two other students to assist him, Abū Ḥamzah al-Sharī and Bilj b. ‘Uqbah. In Oman, his student al-Julandā b. Mas‘ūd led an Ibādī revolution and become the Imam there in 132 A.H. Yet another of his students led a revolution in North Africa in 140 A.H and become an Imam there. He is ‘Abd al-A‘lā. Then there was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Rustum who established an Imamate in Tahart in North Africa in 160 A. H. after the collapse of the previous Imamate. Other students continued Abū ‘Ubaydah’s work at the intellectual level. The most important of these is al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb, who came to Baṣrah from Oman. Another student Abū Sufyān Maḥbūb b. al-Ruḥayl al-Qurashī, also made a significant contribution to the intellectual aspects of the Ibādī movement.

Abū ‘Ubaydah died during the caliphate of al-Manṣur (136-158 A.H.). It can be seen that he had extended the Ibāḍī movement on two major levels. Intellectually he had taken up the work of Jābir and given the basis of law through *ḥadīth* a wider scope, although always requiring *ḥadīth* to be validated by an Ibāḍī *shaykh*. However, it is at the revolutionary level that Abū ‘Ubaydah’s contribution to the Ibāḍī movement is greatest. He inspired and advised three revolutions, in Yemen, Oman and Tahart. Although in Baṣrah he could only be described as an imam of secrecy (*kitmān*), because from the time, he succeeded Jābir in the leadership of the movement in Baṣrah, that movement there was always in a state of secrecy, Nonetheless he seems to have had some control over the revolutionary movements and the Imams established by them outside Baṣrah. These revolutions will be discussed in the next chapter.

Al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb

The full name of Al-Rabī‘ is al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb b. ‘Amr al-Farāhīdī al-‘Umānī al-Baṣrī. He is one of the famous scholars of the Ibāḍīs and participated in building the structure of their movement. He was born in town of Ghadfān in Oman in 75-80 A.H. and died between 175-180 A.H. When he was young he went to Baṣrah, it is not known exactly when al-Rabī‘ left Oman for Baṣrah but it would appear to be at an early age.

The Ibāḍīs consider al-Rabī' to be a direct student of Abū 'Ubaydah. They claim that the people used to go to him for his fatwās, which were highly respected by the Ibāḍīs.¹² Abū 'Ubaydah himself said about al-Rabī': "He is a pious man among us and trustworthy. We put our confidence in him."¹³ Muḥammad b. Maḥbūb reported: "One man came to Abū 'Ubaydah and asked him about a matter and he answered his question. Then he said. Bring al-Rabī' and ask him the same question. When he came he gave a different answer from that of Abū 'Ubaydah. Abū 'Ubaydah discussed that with him to know from where he had derived this opinion. Al-Rabī' told him that he learned it from him. Abū 'Ubaydah told the man who asked the question to take what al-Rabī' said."¹⁴ Abū 'Ubaydah said: "Al-Rabī' is our jurist and Imam."¹⁵

According to the Ibāḍī sources, al-Rabī's teachers were Jābir b. Zayd al-Azdī, Abū 'Ubaydah, Muslim b. Abī Karīmah, Ḍumām b. al-Sā'ib and Abū Nūḥ, Ṣaliḥ al-Dahān. These scholars have influenced al-Rabī' a great deal.¹⁶ He used to say "I learned fiqh from three Abū 'Ubaydah, Ḍumām and Abū Nūḥ."¹⁷ These were famous Ibāḍī scholars in Baṣrah at the time of *kitman*.

Al-Rabī' was selected by Abū 'Ubaydah to go on the pilgrimage to meet Ibāḍīs there and to represent him in conducting their affairs, as it was a practice for the Ibāḍī leaders to meet their members from different parts of the world during the pilgrimage and take an opportunity to spread their ideology.¹⁸ This is an indication

that al-Rabī‘ was a very special student to Abū ‘Ubaydah, and also an acknowledgement of his qualifications.

Al-Rabī‘ is considered by the Ibādīs to be their Imam of *ḥadīth*. His *Musnad* is the main book of *ḥadīth* and is regarded by the Ibādīs as the most authentic book of *ḥadīth*.¹⁹ It is known as *al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣaḥīḥ* and it forms the backbone for the development of Ibādī *fiqh*.²⁰ The original *Musnad* does not exist and the present *Musnad* is the one collected and arranged (*ruttiba*) by Abū Ya‘qūb al-Warjalānī (d.570 A.H).²¹

An examination of the *Musnad* according to this arrangement shows that most of the transmissions are from Abū ‘Ubaydah and Ḍumām. It is divided into four books. The first two contain 742 *ḥadīths*, which are narrated by Abū ‘Ubaydah direct from Jābir followed by the full chain. At the end of the second volume, interspersed with *ḥadīths* 741 and 742, comes the following information deriving from Rabī‘: The *ḥadīths* of ‘Āishah are 68, Anas b. Malik 40, Ibn ‘Abbās 150, Abu Sa’īd al-Khudrī 60, Abū Hurayrah 72. There are 184 *marāṣil*²² transmissions from Jābir and 88 from Abū ‘Ubaydah. The arranger then goes on to say that according to Rabī‘ there are 654 *ḥadīths* to be found in these two parts.²³

With this work al-Rabī' built on the efforts of Jābir b. Zayd and Abū 'Ubaydah. He provided the Ibādīs with a firm basis of *ḥadīth* for the development of their school of law.

¹ Al-Ḥārithī, 139.

² *Ibid.*, 140.

³ Mu'ammār, 'Alī, *al-Ibādīyyah fī Mukīb al-Ta'rīkh*, Oman, vol. I, 159.

⁴⁴ Hashim, *Ta'rīkh al-Khalīf*; Khalayfāt, 106-9; Ennamī, 612-3

⁵ Al-Darjīnī, vol. 248 - 249, Khulayfāt, 16.

⁶ In his book *Tabaqat al-Mashiyakh*.

⁷ 'Abd al-Malik was one of the Ibādī scholars at the time of Abū 'Ubaydah in Baṣrah.

⁸ Al-Darjīnī, vol. II, 248.

⁹ Al-Suhilī, Na'if, 30; al-Darjīnī, vol 250.

¹⁰ Khalayfāt, 8 – 9; al-Darjīnī, op.cit., 249.

¹¹ *Idem.*

¹² Al-Darjīnī, vol. II, 273.

¹³ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 95.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 96.

¹⁵ Al-Darjīnī, vol. II, 276.

¹⁶ Qannubī, Sa'īd, *al-Imam al-Rabī' wa-Musnadah*, Oman, n.d., 22.

¹⁷ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 96.

¹⁸ Al-Ḥārithī, Salim. *Al-'Uqūd al-Fiḍḍiyyah*, 151.

¹⁹ Al-Sālimī, *Sharḥ al-Jam' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, vol. I, 2.

²⁰ Al-Ḥārithī, 149.

²¹ Al-Sālimī, vol. I, 3; al-Ḥārithī, 150; al-Qannubī, Sa'īd, 49.

²² Marāsīl is plural of mursal which mean that if the link between the Successor and the Prophet is missing then the *ḥadīth* is mursal. See Ṣuḥaīb Ḥasan, *An introduction to the Science of Ḥadīth*, Riyaḍ, 1996, 22.

²³ Al-Rabī', Ḥabīb, *al-Jamī' al-ṣaḥīḥ*, 194.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE SPREAD OF THE IBĀDĪ MOVEMENT IN ARABIA

The First Ibādī Imamate in Yemen

As already mentioned, one of Abū ‘Ubaydah’s students in Baṣrah was Ṭālīb al-Ḥaqq ‘Abd Allāh b. Yaḥyā al-Kindī, who came from Yemen. When he returned, he became a *qaḍī* for the Umayyad governor of Ḥaḍramawt, Ibrāhīm b. Jabalah al-Kindī. In this post Ṭālīb al-Ḥaqq seems to have operated a different policy from that of Abū ‘Ubaydah in Baṣrah. However, the policy of dissociation from the authorities in Baṣrah may have been because of the surveillance of the movement by the Umayyads in that city. At any rate, Ṭālīb al-Ḥaqq kept in close contact with Abū ‘Ubaydah and acted according to his orders.¹ It seems that he was not happy with the conduct of the Umayyads² in Yemen for he wrote a letter to Abū ‘Ubaydah, telling him about the situation in Ḥaḍramawt. Abū ‘Ubaydah gave him the green light to start a revolution against the Umayyads. He sent Abū Ḥamzah al-Shārī (al-Mukhtār b. ‘Awf al-Azdī) to him and also wrote a letter in which he said: “If you want to rebel against them, do not wait a single day. I have sent to you a man whose ‘gospel’

is in his heart and one thousand and twelve men.” By the man whose gospel was in his heart he meant Abū Ḥamzah al-Shārī, who was famous for his resolution, bravery and sacrifice.³ By one thousand he meant Bilj b. ‘Uqbah, who was one of Abū ‘Ubaydah’s students and was from the same village in Oman as Abū Ḥamzah. Abū ‘Ubaydah also said:

You do not know when your death will come, and Allāh is the best to guide His servant. He sends them when He wills to defend His religion and chooses them for martyrdom as a tribute to them. When you go, do not exceed the boundaries, nor trespass, but follow the path or way of your good predecessors (*salaf*) and follow their practice (*sunnah*).⁴

Many of the students and followers of Abū ‘Ubaydah left Baṣrah to help Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq in the Ḥaḍramawt. When they arrived there, they selected Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq as their Imam and pledged allegiance (*bay‘ah*) to him in the year 128 A.H. Then they rebelled against the governor, Ibrāhīm b. Jabalah al-Kindī, who had been appointed for al-Qāsim b. ‘Umar al-Thaqafī, the governor of Ṣan‘ā’. The Ibāḍīs rebelled and drove Ibrāhīm out of the Ḥaḍramawt without any fighting.⁵ He left for Ṣan‘ā’ to join his superior. When he arrived there he informed al-Qāsim b. ‘Umar al-Thaqafī about what had happened to him and told him not to be surprised if the Ibāḍī troops came to the town. He was aware that in Ṣan‘ā’ itself and in other towns there were many Ibāḍīs. That caused intense fear in al-Qāsim b. ‘Umar and he organised an army to fight the Ibāḍīs. However, the Ibāḍīs were aware that there was a strong dissatisfaction in Ṣan‘ā’ with the Umayyads because of the system of taxation, which the Ibāḍīs claimed had sucked the blood of the people and was not used for their benefit. Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq left the Ḥaḍramawt to go to Ṣan‘ā’ with his army. With him

were Abū Ḥamzah and Bilj b. ‘Uqbah. When they arrived in Ṣan‘ā’ they surrounded it and found that the troops of the Umayyads waiting for their arrival had wished to fight the Ibāḍīs but for reasons unknown did not attack them. So the Ibāḍīs overcame Ṣan‘ā’ without bloodshed. The army of Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq numbered no more than one thousand and six hundred men in contrast to that of al-Qāsim, which had thirty thousand fighters.⁶ However, that large number was not willing to fight against a few Muslims who were prepared to sell their lives for the sake of Allāh, seeking His grace and pleasure. Of those who went with Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq under the command of Abū Ḥamzah al-Shārī, many were taking it in turns to ride one horse and were sharing one blanket, but this poverty did not stop them from trying to please Allāh.⁷

When the Ibāḍīs liberated Ṣan‘ā’ and found the accumulated wealth which al-Qāsim had collected from the people, they did not take any of it. Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq distributed it among the poor of Ṣan‘ā’ because it had been taken unjustly from them and it was thought that it should go back to them.⁸ When Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq entered Ṣan‘ā’ he made a speech in the mosque, declaring the principles for which he had fought. He said that they were not seeking worldly goods, nor had they come to beg for anything from anybody, but to promote the word of Allāh for His sake only. He said that they had acted when they saw that the signs and values of Allāh’s guidance had been eradicated. The religion of Allāh had become strange among its followers because of the injustice of the Umayyads. He announced that the principles of the Ibāḍīs were as follows: “People are from us and we are from them, except three kinds: atheists

who worship idols; those of the people of the Book who associate other things with Allāh; and those who impose laws other than what is revealed by Allāh.”⁹

Imam Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq declared a general amnesty to all the people of Yemen and he gave them a choice as to whether they wanted to join him or to remain in their homes without causing any trouble.¹⁰ The lbāḍī sources suggest that the reason for the establishment of the Imamate in Yemen, was not to seek revenge against anyone nor to do harm to anyone but to spread justice.¹¹ After Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq had settled in Ṣan‘ā’ he sent Abū Ḥamzah al-Shārī with his army to the Ḥijāz, where some lbāḍīs still remained. Among them was one of the lbāḍī scholars, Abū al-Ḥurr ‘Alī b. Ḥusayn, who lived in Mecca. He was firmly against the authority of the Umayyads, who were watching him because they were afraid that he might rebel against them.¹² Abū Ḥamzah al-Shārī arrived in Mecca and Abū al-Ḥurr heard his voice. He said: “I swear by Allāh, this is a strange voice in this holy place.”¹³ When Abū Ḥamzah entered Mecca, ‘Abd al-Wāhid b. Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Malik, the governor of Mecca, was confused and hesitated about what he should do. His people advised him to attack Abū Ḥamzah. However, Abū Ḥamzah had not come to fight but to make a pilgrimage and to call the people to Allāh. He was not willing to fight in Mecca, no matter who challenged him. This was because the lbāḍīs maintained that Mecca was a sanctuary (*ḥaram*) where it was forbidden for anyone to fight unless he was intentionally provoked. This was in accordance with the Prophet’s statement:

This place is a sanctuary and Allāh has made it sacred from the day that He created the heavens and the earth and fighting was not legitimate for anyone before me and shall not be legitimate after me, but it was legitimate for one hour, for one day.¹⁴

Therefore ‘Abd al-Wāḥid decided to flee and Abū Ḥamzah occupied Mecca without bloodshed.¹⁵ There he made a speech calling the people to the word of Allāh and emphasising the teachings of Islam. After Mecca came under the rule of the Ibāḍī, Abū Ḥamzah, he invited the people to join him in fighting against the oppressors and the tyrants and appealed to them to obey Allāh. He criticised the Umayyads and their government. He said:

O people of Mecca, I asked you about your governors and you said that they were tyrants, for they did not judge in accordance with the Book of Allāh, but in accordance with their own desires. They consumed the forbidden gains and they carried out injustice against you. You are right, so come and join us against them if you say that you are weak. Do not help them to fight us but leave them on their own. Now I return the properties of the Muslims to them.¹⁶

Abū Ḥamzah’s army continued its advance toward Medina. In the meantime, ‘Abd al-Wāḥid had told the people of Medina that if they did not fight the Ibāḍīs their names would be removed from the official register (*dīwān*).¹⁷ When the Ibāḍīs reached Qudayd,¹⁸ the people of Medina met them there. The leader of the Umayyads was ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān. He asked the Ibāḍīs to go back and stop fighting but they refused. He then asked the Ibāḍīs about ‘Uthmān, so Bilj b. ‘Uqbah told him: “The Muslims have renounced him and I am following in their footsteps.”¹⁹ So ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān said “Go back to your group.” Between us there are swords.” However, Abū Ḥamzah warned his army to be patient and not to begin the fighting. They remained like this until the people of Medina shot their arrows and hit one of the men. Then Abū Ḥamzah told his people, Now fighting is permitted.”²⁰ So the Ibāḍīs fought the people of Medina

and defeated them, leaving behind four thousand dead. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was killed in that battle, which took place in 130. A.H. According to al-Shammākhī, Abū Ḥamzah gave instructions not to kill the wounded. Abū al-Ḥurr ‘Alī b. Ḥusayn told Abū Ḥamza that he should prepare the graves of the wounded and kill them. However, he refused, saying that it was not the policy of their predecessors (*salaf*), and that he wanted to abstain from killing them. In this he was following the precedent of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib at the Battle of the Camel and illustrating the Ibāḍī doctrine that although the Medinans should be fought, their *kuf*r did not amount to *shirk*. When ‘Abd al-Wāḥid heard that his army had been defeated he fled from Medina.²¹ It seems that the Ibāḍī victory in Qudayd was occurred for the following reasons:

1. They were dedicated to their aim of establishing an Imamate according to their principles.
2. They had the support of the Ibāḍīs of Ḥijāz, who participated in the battle of Qudayd.
3. It seems that the central government was not ready to fight the Ibāḍīs at that time and also that it was not able to send support from Syria.
4. Another important reason for their victory was the belief that it was a grave sin to run from the battlefield.

This battle enabled the Ibāḍīs to control all of the Ḥijāz and spread their ideology. The army of Abū Ḥamzah, led by Bilj b. ‘Uqbah, entered Medina in Ṣafar 130 A.H. Then Abū Ḥamzah al-Shārī arrived there and asked the people of Medina to pledge

allegiance to ‘Abd Allāh b. Yaḥyā. However, it is uncertain whether they did so or not. When he entered Medina with his army he touched with his face the *minbar*²² where the Prophet used to place his feet. He wept for a long time and said: “How many feet have violated the law of Allāh, abused His servant, and ruled in a way that was contrary to the *Sunnah* of the Prophet.” Then he made a famous speech in which he said:

People of Medina, you accuse me and my colleagues of being youths. So were the Companions of the Prophet. Yes, they are youths. By Allāh, they take pride in being youths. Their eyes are far from what is forbidden and their feet are far from injustice. They are dedicated to worship and piety. They are sleepless at night and they fast during the day. The earth has become ingrained in their foreheads, their hands and their knees as a result of prayer at night and fasting. Allāh has seen them in the middle of the night reading the Qur’ān. If one of them reads a verse mentioning paradise, he yearns for it. And if he sees a verse mentioning hell, he fears it. When they see that swords, spears and arrows have been pointed against them and that they are facing death, they fear Allāh instead. They face the violence of the spearheads, the arrows and the blades of the swords with their faces, chests and bodies.”²³

After the Ibāḍīs took over Medina, it seemed that they were planning to spread their movement to all parts of the Muslim world. However, they pursued a narrow religious policy based on their understanding of Islam. The Umayyads mounted a counter attack with troops which arrived from Syria under the command of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Muhammad b. ‘Aṭīyyah al-Sa‘adī. As they advanced towards Medina, Abū Ḥamzah sent Bilj b. ‘Uqbah against them. The two armies met at the Wadī al-Qurā and the Ibāḍīs were defeated.²⁴ As a result Abū Ḥamzah decided to withdraw to Mecca. The control of the Ibāḍīs over Medina had lasted for only three months. The Umayyads continued their advance toward Mecca. ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Aṭīyyah entered Mecca from three directions and the battle began. At the beginning of the

battle the Syrians were prevented from advancing but as the battle continued, the Ibāḍīs and Abū Ḥamzah were defeated. Then the Syrian army continued its efforts to drive the Ibāḍīs from the Ḥijāz into Yemen.²⁵ They met the Ibāḍī Imam, Ṭālīb al-Ḥaqq, at a town called Ṣa‘dah²⁶ Again the Syrians were successful and the Ibāḍī Imam was killed. After his death the Ibāḍīs scattered in Yemen. Instead of having a unified command each group defended its own territory.²⁷ In this way the Ibāḍīs were pushed into the fringes, and the Ḥaḍramawt and South Arabia which became a centre for them. The war between the Ibāḍīs and the Umayyads continued for two years. Eventually the Umayyad army marched towards the Ḥaḍramawt. The Ibāḍīs struggled to prevent it from advancing but they failed and a large number of them were killed. Most of the survivors in the Ḥaḍramawt gave the pledge of allegiance to Sa‘īd b. ‘Abd Allāh as an Imam of defence. Ibn ‘Aṭīyyah went to the Ḥaḍramawt himself and conquered Shibām, the last centre of the Ibāḍīs.²⁸ After their defeat, the Ibāḍīs remained without an Imamate in the Ḥaḍramawt for a long time. There are letters in *al-Siyar* which show that the Ḥaḍramwat Ibāḍīs used to send letters to the Ibāḍī scholars in Oman asking them to solve their disputes.²⁹ They never established another Imamate in the Ḥaḍramawt after Ṭālīb al-Ḥaqq. The Ibāḍī Imamate ended in the Ḥaḍramawt in 132. A. H. Their attempt to establish a full Imamate failed for the

following reasons:

1. The lack of financial resources.
2. Their effort to establish an Imamate in surroundings hostile to their understanding made it difficult for them to achieve their aim.
3. The Ibāḍīs were not supported in Yemen because of their attitude toward others.

However, their attempt in Yemen had given the Ibādī leaders political experience that was to help in establishing the first Ibādī Imamate in Oman.

The spread of the Ibādī movement in Oman

It should be noted that the first Imam selected by the Khārijites, ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī, was from Azd. Al-Baghdādī reported that two of the survivors of the Battle of al-Nahrawān went to Yemen and another two went to Oman. The Ibādīs who went there later were their followers.³⁰ In addition it might be true to say that some of those who were not at al-Nahrawān participated in spreading the ideology of the Khārijites in Oman. In support of this, the Ibādī sources confirm that from the time of Mu‘āwiyah to that of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān Oman was independent. When al-Ḥajjāj was appointed governor of Iraq, he attacked Oman. It was defended by Sa‘īd and Sulaymān b. ‘Abād b. ‘Abd al-Julandā until he overcame them and took control of Oman.³¹ This is a clear sign that they were rejecting the Ummayyad authorities because of the Khārijites influence. Then a dispute occurred between the Khārijites and al-Ḥajjāj which resulted in ‘Imrān b. Ḥaṭṭān³² going to Syria and then to Oman, where he found the Omanis praising and adopting the ideas of Abū Bilāl Midras. However, the presence of ‘Imrān aided the spread of the Ibādī doctrine. The Omanis were also aware of Ibn Ḥaṭṭān’s poems³³ which are considered to be an early indication of the presence of the Khārijite group in Oman. So Ibn Ḥaṭṭān lived there and participated in spreading the Ibādī doctrine until his death.³⁴

Another reason for the success of the Ibādīs was due, in part, to the travelling habits of the Ibādī scholars, including Jābir Abū ‘Ubaydah and al-Rabī ‘ b. Ḥabīb. Every year they went to Mecca to perform. Here, they held meetings with the distant Ibādī members from different countries and spread their message. The way they did this was to send one of their famous scholars and pitch a tent for him. The tent was a centre for preaching to others and a meeting place for the Ibādī scholars to discuss various issues concerning their movement. This had a significant impact on strengthening the relationship of the Ibādīs scattered across various regions, making it an easier task to spread the Ibādī doctrine among their tribes while they were under secrecy and *taqiyyah*.

The second indication of the Khārijites in Oman was that al-Hajjāj exiled Jābir b. Zayd to that country. While Jābir was there, he took the opportunity to spread the ideas of the Ibādīs. However, the exact period of Jābir’s stay in Oman is not known.³⁵ He might have travelled to Oman at different times because it was his homeland, to visit his family and to spread the ideas of the movement. That might have been also true of other members of the Ibādī movement during the secret period, for it is known that the Ibādī scholars taught by Jābir b. Zayd in Baṣrah were from the Azd tribe in Oman.³⁶ The scholars of the movement included Abū Nūḥ Sāliḥ al-Dahan, Ḍumām, Ja’far al-Sammāk³⁷ and Abū Dawood Ḥājib al-Ṭā’ī.³⁸ This made it easier for them to transfer the ideas of the movement to Oman among individuals of the same tribe.

After the death of Jābir and ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibāḍ, Abū ‘Ubaydah became the leader of the movement. The organisational skills and political intelligence of Abū ‘Ubaydah became apparent when he chose to send *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* to those countries far from the centre of the Caliphate. In this sense, Oman, the Ḥaḍramawt and the North African countries comprised a practical choice of locations for enabling further activity for the movement, especially if we bear in mind influential factors such as the fact that the caliphate was occupied in fighting the extremist Khārijites. As a result, the Ibāḍī movement was more successful in these locations than in countries closer to the strongholds of the caliphate. The *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* were sent to various countries including Yemen, Oman and North Africa. This is indicative of the fact that there was a connection between the leadership of the movement in Baṣrah and the students of knowledge in different countries. Secondly, it seems that *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* received thorough training and gained vast knowledge in the school of Abū ‘Ubaydah Muslim b. Abī Karīmah. Such schooling was held secretly in an underground section of his home.³⁹ The *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* were from the Azd tribe of Oman. This connection proved to be useful owing to the fact that their offices were also in Oman, thus capitalising on the presence of the *ḥamalat al-‘ilm*. It was apparent that Abū ‘Ubaydah had sent various students of knowledge to Oman throughout different periods. After Abū ‘Ubaydah took over the leadership of the Ibāḍīs. It is most probable that the *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* reached Oman at the end of the first century A.H. or at the beginning of the second. This is indicated by the order of Abū ‘Ubaydah to a group of Omanīs to go to Yemen in 128. A.H. to participate in

establishing the Ibāḍī imamate. Among them were Abū Ḥamzah al-Sharī, Bilj b. ‘Uqbah and al-Julandā b. Mas‘ūd. The general climate in Oman was receptive to the Ibāḍī doctrine from an early stage as mentioned above. The student of knowledge resided in Oman and acted as messengers between Oman and Baṣrah until they were able to establish the first Imamate in Oman.

The second group of *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* were: Bashīr b. al-Mundhir al-Nazwanī (d. 178 .A.H); Mūsā b. Abī Jābir al-Azkawī (d.181.A.H.); Munīr b. Nayyar Ja‘lānī (d. second century A.H.); Hashim b. Ghīlān (d. second century A.H); and Muḥammad b. Mu‘alla al-Kindī (d. second century A.H.).

They were all sent by al-Rabī‘. The Ibāḍī scholars in Baṣrah returned to Oman, where they proceeded to spread the Ibāḍī movement after the death of Abū ‘Ubaydah. The Imam of the secret period was al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb al- Farāhīdī (d. 170 A.H.) and his student was Abū Sufyān Maḥbūb b. al-Ruḥayl (second century A.H.)⁴⁰ There were a number of important reasons for the success in persuading the people of Oman to be part of the Ibāḍī movement. First, substantial efforts were made by the *ḥamalat al-‘ilm*; second, their tribes protected them; and thirdly, they conducted their work in a secretive manner. An important achievement was that they were able to gain the sympathy and to recruit members of the family of al-Julandā who had previously ruled Oman. This was a very important factor in facilitating the

spread of the Ibāḍī movement throughout Oman. Some of the reasons which led to the success of the Ibāḍī movement in Oman are outlined below.

Most of the *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* were from the Azd tribe which made their task easier. Additionally, they had the co-operation of the people of their tribe. The political situation in Oman at that time was helpful, owing to the fact that the governors of Oman were also from the Azd tribe and so they made the assignments of the *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* more trouble-free. Ibāḍī sources confirm that these governors were Ibāḍī; in reality, however they were under the system of *taqiyyah*. The Ibāḍī sources go on to say that Janāḥ b. Qays al-Hinā’ī and his son Muḥammad turned a blind eye to the movements of the Ibāḍī activists in Oman. Clearly, this facilitated the spread of the Ibāḍī doctrine in the country. However, the fundamental reason behind the spread of the Ibāḍī movement in that country was the *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* because they had lived in Oman during different successive periods. The impact of Abū ‘Ubaydah’s teachings in preparing these *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* became apparent in the role they played in the political life of Oman. As *ḥamalat al-‘ilm*, they were not only jurists and *muftis*, which enabled them to spread the doctrine of their movement but, also prominent political leaders. Further, nomination of an Imam had to be made with the consent of the *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* as a prerequisite. In other words, they possessed the calibre of both statesmen and intellectuals at the same time.⁴¹

The first Ibādī Imamate in Oman

After the failure of the Ibādī Imamate in Yemen and the Ḥaḍramawt, Abū ‘Ubaydah ordered the Ibādīs in Oman to set up an Imamate there. They gave the pledge of allegiance to al-Julandā b. Mas‘ūd as their Imam in 132 A.H. He had participated in establishing the unsuccessful Imamate in the Ḥaḍramawt.⁴² In addition, he was from the family, that was in power at the time of the Prophet and had accepted Islam when he sent his messenger to it.⁴³ The Ibādīs regard al-Julandā as the first Imam who formed a real Islamic state after seizing it from the hands of the tyrants.⁴⁴ The decision to appoint him had been made by the *shūrā*, which comprised the well-known scholars who had studied under the Ibādī scholars in Baṣrah.⁴⁵ However, there were three members of the Imam’s family who refused to accept him as their Imam. These were Ja‘far b. Sa‘īd al-Julandānī and his two sons, al-Naẓr and Zā’dah. Because they refused to give him the pledge of allegiance they were killed. However, these were al-Julandā’s relatives and he was much distressed by what happened to them. He had a dispute with the *shūrā*, as a consequence of which he was removed from the Imamate.⁴⁶ However, since it was clear that he was the most acceptable person to the Omanīs, he was offered the Imamate again and accepted it.⁴⁷ He managed to extend his authority over most of Oman. Such was the Ibādī attitude to the Khārijite leader Shaybān ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Yashkurī⁴⁸ who rebelled against the Abbasids, in Baṣrah, that al-Julandā thought it was expedient to send an army of the

Ibāḍī tribesmen against him. They defeated Shaybān and he was killed. However, although Shaybān with his Khārijite views may have presented a threat to the Ibāḍī Imamate in Oman, by removing him the Ibāḍīs exposed themselves to the Abbasids. Al-Ṣaffaḥ, the Abbasid Caliph, directed a campaign against the Ibāḍīs and the Ṣafrites.⁴⁹ He sent an army under Khāzim b. Khuzaymah al-Khurasānī to deal with Shaybān. When they reached Oman, Shaybān had already been defeated and killed by the Ibāḍīs.⁵⁰

The other reason is Shayban that left Baṣrah in flight from the Abbasids. They followed him to Oman and found he had already been killed by the Ibāḍīs, so Khāzim now turned his attention to the Ibāḍīs. He demanded that al-Julandā b. Mas'ūd surrender to the Abbasid Caliph. Al-Julandā consulted his council member, who decided to give Khāzim Shaybān's sword, his ring and some wealth. But Khāzim refused to take these and asked for Ibāḍī submission to the Abbasid caliphate and for the Caliph's name to be mentioned in the Friday sermon. The *shūrā* was consulted again and its members decided that it was not allowed to safeguard the state at the expense of religion.⁵¹ However, they agreed to give tribute if Khāzim agreed not to attack the Ibāḍīs. Khāzim refused this and war broke out between Khāzim and al-Julandā. Khāzim realised that it would be difficult to attack the Ibāḍīs by land and chose to bring his troops in by sea. Al-Julandā had not expected this and was taken by surprise, especially when Khāzim's army burned down the houses of the Ibāḍīs.⁵² This kept them busy saving their wives and children.⁵³

Nearly all the soldiers in al-Julandā's army were killed. When only al-Julandā and Hilāl b. 'Aṭīyyah remained, Hilāl suggested that they should continue to fight and they were both killed. This took place in 134 A.H.

Al-Ṭabarī's account of Khāzim mission is that al-Ṣaffaḥ was advised to send an army to eradicate danger caused by Shaybān, and to avenge the killing of some Khurasānīs. Consequently, he designated seven hundred of his military to join Khazim in fighting Shayban. Some members of Khazim's family joined him as well as people from Marū, who were well known to him and would be trusted. When Khāzim went to Baṣrah, a group of the Banī Tamīm joined him. At this point Khāzim sent Naḍlah b. Nu'īm al-Nahshalī with five hundred men after Shaybān. Fighting broke out between them, which resulted in Shaybān fleeing to Oman, where he was killed by al-Julandā and his troops. Then conflict arose between the Ibāḍīs and Khāzim after several days it resulted in the death of ten thousand Ibāḍīs.⁵⁴ Al-Ṭabarī does not give any details about what happened between the Ibāḍīs and Khāzim except the burning of their houses and the number of the Ibāḍīs killed. It seems that even the death toll was exaggerated in his account.

The Imamate had lasted for two years and one month. Oman was now under the control of the Abbasid Caliph. The sons of the members of the Julandā family (who had been killed because they refused to pledge allegiance to al-Julandā), Muḥammad b. Za'idah and Rashīd b. al-Naẓr, now became the Abbasid governors of Oman.⁵⁵

However, despite the initial failure of the Ibāḍī Imamate in Oman, the Ibāḍī movement still had a hold over the minds of the people there.⁵⁶ Yet the failure of the first Imamate in Oman may also have been due to some extent to the internal disputes among the Ibāḍī scholars, such as removing al-Julandā and then reappointing him, as well as killing his two relatives against his wishes.

During his brief Imamate, al-Julandā b. Mas'ūd divided his state into regions, for each of which he appointed a ruler, a judge, and a finance secretary to collect *zakāt* and taxes. He also divided the army into companies, each one consisting of 300 to 400 soldiers. For each company, he appointed a leader, who was to be knowledgeable, strong and steadfast. He further subdivided the companies into platoons, each one consisting of 10 soldiers. For each platoon, he appointed a teacher to educate them and teach them religion. Hence the soldiers of al-Julandā were known as the *shurāt*, the people who have sold themselves for the sake of Allāh.⁵⁷

He also instituted a monthly salary of seven *dirhams* for each soldier. However, the state did not have a navy, which was why refused to take any tax from seamen because it could not protect them.⁵⁸ Thus Khāzim was able to defeat al-Julandā by bringing his army by sea. On the social side, al-Julandā was described as a just ruler and people were treated equally, while wealth was distributed evenly and in accordance with the Qur'ān. women were asked to dress modestly and to follow the commandments of Allāh.⁵⁹

The second Ibādī Imamate in Oman

After the collapse of the first Imamate as mentioned earlier, Oman was governed by Rāshid al-Naẓr and Muḥammad b. Zā'idah under the authority of the Abbasid state. They were both from the family of al-Julandā, who had initially objected to the Ibādī Imamate in Oman and asked for submission to the Abbasid state. However, although the Ibādīs considered that period to be especially marked by the fact that it was under the rule of tyrants,⁶⁰ it seems that there was not very great oppression of the Ibādīs in Oman. As long as they did not spread their ideology too ostentatiously in public, they were allowed to continue developing their movement. During the next forty years, the Ibādīs worked in secret (*kitmān*) in Oman, using *taqiyyah*. Their strength increased while at the same time the authority of the Abbasids weakened. When the Ibādī *ḥamalat al-‘ilm* felt the situation was appropriate, they held a *shūrā* at Nizwā⁶¹ in Oman. Among the scholars who attended this *shūrā* were Muḥammad b. al-Ma'allā al-Kindī, Bashīr b. al-Mundhr al-Nizwānī, Mūsā b. Abī Jābir al-Azkawī and ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥamīd.⁶² They were all former students of Abū ‘Ubaydah and from the tribe of Azd, and they had taken on the task of extending Ibādī influence as he had taught. At the *shūrā*, it was Mūsā b. Abī Jābir who took the initiative. The first course of action decided by the *shūrā* was that their opponents should be removed from Nizwā and sent elsewhere in Oman. In 177 A.H. the scholars of the *shūrā* felt that they were able to appoint an Imam. They decided to offer the pledge of allegiance to Muḥammad b. Abī ‘Affān al-Azdī⁶³ and he

accepted. Muḥammad b. Abī ‘Affān consolidated Ibāḍī power in Oman and secured it from outside threat.⁶⁴ However, it was not long before tension arose between the new Imam and the scholars of the *shūrā*. They felt that he was acting arrogantly and refusing to accept their advice, thereby violating the pledge of allegiance he had given to them. Again, it was Mūsā b. Abī Jābir al-Azkawī, the pre-eminent scholar of the Ibāḍīs at the time, who led the complaints. It was claimed that Muḥammad b. Abī ‘Affān had been appointed only to secure the situation from outside attack. Now that that had been accomplished, his services as Imam of defence (*difā’*) were no longer needed. The *shūrā* removed him from office and forced him out of Nizwā. His Imamate had lasted two years and one month.⁶⁵ Following the dismissal of Muḥammad b. Abī ‘Affān and his expulsion from Nizwā because of his unpopular behaviour, the *shūrā* selected another Imam in 179 A.H., who was more suited to their wishes. This was al-Wārith b. Ka‘b al-Kharūsī. It seems that his pledge of allegiance was more permanent than that of Muḥammad b. Abī ‘Affān. It was given to him on the basis that he would be “a just Imam, enjoining good and prohibiting evil, upholding the truth and suppressing falsehood, encouraging *jihād* for the sake of Allāh and fighting against those parties who transgressed.” This pledge of allegiance was made to him first by Mūsā b. Abī Jābir al-Azkawī, and then by the scholars of the *shūrā* and the general populace in Nizwā.

In the course of his Imamate, which lasted sixteen years and six months, the Ibāḍīs seem to have been satisfied with al-Wārith b. Ka‘b. Al-Sālimī reported: “Al-Wārith

b. Ka‘b followed the path of the pious predecessors. He ruled Oman along the correct path which ultimately led to the [full] emergence of the mission (*da‘wah*) of the Muslims [in Oman] and the obliteration of unbelief.”

During his Imamate, al-Wārith had to face another attempt by the Abbasids to gain control of Oman. The Abbasid Caliph al-Rashīd sent an expeditionary force under the leadership of ‘Isā b. Ja‘far to subdue the Ibāḍīs and restore Oman to the Abbasids. However, al-Wārith’s tribesmen were able to defeat them and ‘Isā himself was killed. This led to some controversy among the Ibāḍīs because he had not been killed on the orders of the Imam al-Wārith and it seemed in contravention of the Ibāḍī view that those defeated should not be killed. However, some of the supporters of the action claimed that it was necessary for him to be killed because he was responsible for the death of many “Muslims”. This argument proved sufficient and the controversy was settled. Al-Wārith continued his successful Imamate until he died as the result of an unfortunate accident when he was drowned in Nizwā in 192 A.H.

The Ibāḍīs continued to maintain their Imamate in Oman under the various levels of the imamate until the twentieth century.

- ¹ Ibn Sallām, 112; Muḥammad b. Maḥbūb, *Sirat Muḥammad*, vol. II, 265.
- ² Ibn Sallām, 112.
- ³ Abū al-Ḥasan al-Basīānī, vol. II, 104.
- ⁴ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 91.
- ⁵ Khalīfah b. Khayāṭ, *Ta'rīkh Khalīfah*, 384.
- ⁶ *Idem.*
- ⁷ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 92.
- ⁸ *Idem.*
- ⁹ Ḥāshim Maḥdī Ṭālib, *al-Ḥarakah al-Ibāḍīyyah fī al-Mashriq*, Baghdad, 1981, 114-17
- ¹⁰ *Idem.*
- ¹¹ Al-Dirjīnī, vol. II, 267; Muḥammad Al-Kindī, *Bayan al-Shar'*, vol. 28, 108.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, 262.
- ¹³ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 92.
- ¹⁴ *Idem.*
- ¹⁵ Hashim, 128-9.
- ¹⁶ Ibn Sallām, 112; Khalīfah, 166.
- ¹⁷ Ibn Sallām, 113.
- ¹⁸ It is small town between Mecca and Medina.
- ¹⁹ Ibn Sallām, 113.
- ²⁰ *Idem.*
- ²¹ *Idem.*
- ²² The *minbar* is the pulpit where the Muslim Imam gives the Friday sermon.
- ²³ Khalīfah, 385; Muḥammad, Al-Kindī, *Bayan al-Shar'*, vol. XXVUI, 170; al-Dirjīnī vol. I, 268.
- ²⁴ Ḥāshim, Maḥdī, *al-Ḥarakah al-Ibāḍīyyah fī al-Mashriq al-'Arabī*, Baghdad, 1981, 145.
- ²⁵ *Idem.*
- ²⁶ One of the cities of Yemen, 180 km from Ṣan'ā'.
- ²⁷ *Idem.*
- ²⁸ *Idem.*
- ²⁹ There is a *Sirah* written by Maḥbūb b. Ruḥayl regarding the disputes between Ibāḍī scholars; See, *al-Siyar*, pp. 305-321.
- ³⁰ Al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*. 60; al-Shahrastānī, Abū al-Faṭḥ, *al-Milal wal-Niḥal*, vol. I, 135.
- ³¹ *Tuḥfat al-A'ayān*, al-Sālimī, vol. I, 75-7.
- ³² He left Iraq and went to Syria to hide from al-Ḥajjāj because of his attack on him in one of his poems. He had described al-Ḥajjāj as a coward and full of fear, which resulted in 'Abd al-Malik authorising his killing (*ahdar damahu*). When he reached Syria he stayed as a guest with Ruḥ b.

Zinbā' ('Abd al-Malik's minister). When discovered, he fled to Arabia and arrived in Oman. Al-'Awtabī, vol. II, 16-18.

³³ His role was to defend the Khārijites by his poem. example of this is his praise of 'Abd al-Ruḥmān b. Muḥjūm for the killing of 'Alī. He described him as pious and brave and deserving paradise for such a deed.

³⁴ Al-'Awtabī, vol. II, 19.

³⁵ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 76.

³⁶ Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, vol. II, 315.

³⁷ Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 86; Al-Darjīnī, 232-33; Al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, vol. II, 314-315.

³⁸ He was responsible for the finance of the Ibādīs in Baṣrah in addition to supervising the *ḥamalat al-'ilm* and solving the conflicts among them. Al-Shammākhī, vol. I, 90.

³⁹ Khulayfat, 'Awaḍ, *Nashat al-Ḥarakah al-Ibāḍiyyah*, Amman, 1978, 128.

⁴⁰ *Idem.*

⁴¹ Hāshim, Maḥdī, *al-Ḥarakah al-Ibāḍiyyah fī al-Mashriq al-'Arabī*, Baghdad, 1981, 127.

⁴² Qarqash, Muḥammad, *'Umān wa al-Ḥarakah al-Ibāḍiyyah*, Oman, 1990, 195.

⁴³ Munīr b. Al-Nayyar, *Sirar Munīr b. Al-Nayyar*. vol. I, 237.

⁴⁴ *Tuḥfat al-A'ayān*, Al-Sālimī, 88.

⁴⁵ *Idem.*

⁴⁶ This means that obeying Khāzim and fulfilling his requests are regarded as committing sins in religion; *Idem.*

⁴⁷ This shows the power of the *shūrā* in the Ibādī constitution.

⁴⁸ He was the leader of al-Ṣaffriah, and came to Oman with his army on the run from al-Ṣaffaḥ, who sent an army after him; Al-Sālimī, 94.

⁴⁹ Al-Ṭabarī mentions that Khāzim was sent to both the Ibādī, and Shaybān.

⁵⁰ Al-Ṭabarī, vol. VII, 462-43.

⁵¹ Abū Qaḥṭān, vol. II, 114.

⁵² Al-Ṭabarī, mentioned that their houses made of wood.

⁵³ Al-Ṭabarī, vol. VII, 463.

⁵⁴ *Idem.*

⁵⁵ Qarqash, 209.

⁵⁶ Munīr b. al-Nayyar, vol. II, 238

⁵⁷ *Idem.*

⁵⁸ *Idem.*

⁵⁹ *Idem.*

⁶⁰ Ḥamīd Ibn Ruzayq, *al-Shu'ā' al-Shā'i' bi-al-Lama'ān*, ed. 'Abd al-Mun'im 'Amir, Oman, 1978, 23.

⁶¹ Nizwa, the largest city of interior Oman, is located 160 km from Muscat and used to be the capital of the Imams of Oman.

⁶² *Tuḥfat al-A'ayān* Al-Sālimī, vol. I, 109.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 111.

⁶⁴ Ibn Ruzaq, 23 ; al-Sālimī, 111.

⁶⁵ Al-Azkawī, *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ*, ed. ‘Abd al-Majīd Ḥasīb al-Qaysī, 45.

CONCLUSION

Ibādī political and constitutional theory is underpinned by the Ibādī view of the early events in Islamic history. As far as Ibādīs are concerned, this theory is based on the Qur'ān, the Sunnah of the Prophet and the Sunnah of the first two Caliphs, Abū Bakr and 'Umar. It is the Qur'ān, above all else, which defines their attitude. It is the demands of the Qur'ān which must be met and it is the Qur'ān which defines the status of those who fail to meet its demands. Thus, it was by their failure to meet the demands of the Qur'ān that 'Uthmān and 'Alī were guilty of *kufṛ* according to Ibādī interpretation of the Qur'ān.

This crucial conception of *kufṛ* in the Ibādī understanding is publicly defined by Ibn Ibād. It is not the equivalent of polytheism (*shirk*) as Ibn al-Azraq had argued. This *kufṛ* was not total unbelief but a half-way house between total unbelief and full belief. It was a failure to observe the requirements of the Qur'ān in such a way that the one involved in such a failure could be regarded as ceasing to be a true believer. He had shown his unbelief and ingratitude to the graces and laws of Allāh (*kufṛ bi-al-ni'am wa-al-aḥkam*). Thus, if it were possible to withdraw from a society which was ruled by such a *kāfir*, it was legitimate, though not absolutely necessary, to do so. However, it was necessary, whether in secret or in public, to work for the re-establishment of leadership that was based on true Islam.

This true Islamic leadership was to be found in the Imamate. The establishment of the institution of the Imamate was a requirement of both the Qur'ān and the Sunnah of the Prophet. The first two Imams had been Abū Bakr and 'Umar. They had continued the procedures and province of the office of the Imamate through consultation with and the agreement of the Companions of the Prophet.

The theoretical framework of the Ibāḍī paths of religion (*masālik al-dīn*) was based on the experiences of those early years of Islamic history. However, the paths of religion were also used to define different events within those early years.

The path of secrecy, with its corollary *taqiyyah*, was open to all Ibāḍīs in times of oppression so that they could remain true to Islam and work for its restoration without endangering their lives. Perhaps the greatest Ibāḍī example of this is Jābir b. Zayd al-Azdī. He seems to have been in overall charge of the movement when at different times other groups of Ibāḍīs were more open in their hostility to the authorities. Abū Bilāl had sacrificed his life; Ibn Ibāḍ had been involved with the defence of Mecca, the argument with Ibn al-Azraq over *shirk* and *kufr* and in the public correspondence with 'Abd al-Mālik; and Abū 'Ubaydah and some other students of Jābir's had taken part in Ibn al-Ash'ath's revolt.

Abū Bilāl was an outstanding example of the path of sacrifice (*shirā'*). The Imam of sacrifice is the Imam who, by his martyrdom, gives a fresh light and invigoration to the faith of the believers. He stands out against oppression and encourages the secret

activities of those still in the state of *kitmān* to establish the true Imamate, which is one of the dearest wishes of all faithful Ibādīs. The requirement that one who pledges *shirā'* can only desist from it when only three are left underlines the sacrificial nature of the enterprise.

The path of defence and its Imam is a useful way of describing a situation where a brave and able Ibādī is able to undertake the defence of the community when another more intellectually able leader might not be effective. One of the examples the Ibādīs give of such an Imam is 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Rāsibī, who led the defence against 'Alī when, perhaps, Hurqūs would have been the preferred choice for the full Imamate. On that occasion, the Imam of defence was defeated. This led the Ibādīs to two options: either to take the path of sacrifice or to take the path of secrecy. Many followed 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb to death, but others returned to the path of secrecy. On the other hand, if the Imam of defence was successful, the fact that his Imamate was theoretically limited to the time of defence meant that his Imamate came to an end and a new Imam, perhaps more suited to the full Imamate, could be chosen. This was the argument used to dismiss Muḥammad b. Abī 'Affān and appoint al-Wārīth b. Ka'b in 179 A.H.

At all stages, whether of secrecy, sacrifice, defence or the full Imamate, the concepts of association (*walāyah*) and disassociation (*barā'ah*) defined Ibādī relations with one another and with the outside world. They were in association with each other and they were disassociated from the rest of the world. Disassociation was a means of

regulating the Ibāḍī community at all times, whether in secret or in public. It could be applied to the weakest and the most important if they failed to live up to the standards set by Allāh for society. On the other hand, association was a means of binding the community together in good times and bad.

The early history of the Ibāḍīs sees the spread of their movement under all the first three paths of religion. Jābir b. Zayd al-Azdī operated in secret in Baṣrah, spreading the ideology, particularly among the tribe of Azd. He was succeeded by Abū ‘Ubaydah, who continued the operation in secret in Baṣrah. However, he had the vision to see that the movement must extend its horizons beyond Baṣrah and the Islamic heartlands. He initiated the three types of *majlis*. The *majlis* of the students was used to train propagandists who would spread the Ibāḍī ideology to the remoter areas of the Islamic world, to North Africa, to Yemen, and above all to Oman. It was to these places that Abū ‘Ubaydah was able to send his students and to initiate the institution of the full Imamate, even if outside the main centres of Islam. The *majlis* of the scholars was probably the forerunner of the *shūrā*.

The intellectual foundation of the movement had been laid by Jābir, who was able to add *ḥadīth* to the basis of the ideology in addition to the Qur’ān. Abū ‘Ubaydah took up his work and developed it. However, it was al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb who produced the Musnad which was to provide the Ibāḍīs with a body of *ḥadīths* to enable them to develop their own legal system.

In the institutions of the full Imamate, the *shūrā* is perhaps the most significant element. As this *shūrā* was elaborated upon by the Ibādīs, it was shown to be an institution which had democratic basis. The *shūrā* of scholars, who had emerged as leaders of the community, selected the Imam, advised him when he was in office and removed him if he failed. This institution thus had far more sweeping powers than any such institution elsewhere in Islam. Although, it is claimed that it is based on the practice of the Prophet, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar in Medina, the Ibādīs actually gave it more authority.

At a very early stage, the Ibādīs also questioned the idea of the Imamate being the sole prerogative of the Quraysh. Their emphasis on the ability and piety of the man who held the office also seemed to add a more democratic element to the Imamate. It was a man’s standing in Islam, and not his tribal background, which was to be considered when appointing an Imam. The Ibādīs also laid great emphasis on the duties of the Imam which stressing that the role was not something to be undertaken lightly.

The fact that the Ibādīs could allow Imams to exist in two separate places showed that they accepted the political implications of trying to rule two distant places. In addition, that fact that until the whole Islamic world was united under one Imamate, the Imam could not be referred to as the Commander of the Faithful indicated that they were aware of the limitations of those far fringes Imamates. However, the

Ibāḍīs evolved a political and constitutional system, which was a fine example of Islamic government, as defined by their understanding of such government.

I

THE POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF ASSOCIATION (*WALĀYAH*) AND DISSOCIATION (*BARĀ'AH*) FOR THE IBĀDĪ

Throughout this thesis, there has been frequent mention of the Ibādīs associating with some Muslims and dissociating themselves from or renouncing others. This has been based on the Ibādī understanding of the terms *walāyah* and *barā'ah*. Derivatives of socio-political connotations of these words originate in pre-Islamic Arabic and the Qur'ān. As adopted by the Ibādīs, these words define the Ibādīs' relationships with one another, other Muslims and people of other religions.

In the Qur'ān the terms *walī* (plural *awliya'*) and *mawlā* (plural *mawālī*),¹ both related to the concept of *walāyah*, are used frequently. Allāh is described as “the *walī* of those who believe” (2:257). This is usually translated as “protector”, “guardian” or “supporter”. Allāh is also described as “the *mawlā* of those who believe”, usually translated as “Lord”, “Protector” or “helper”. Both of these words have traces of pre-Islamic usage, which was continued in Islam. In one sense, the *walī* was the leader of a family group and it was his task to act on its behalf in matters of blood-vengeance and marriage. The word is also used in this sense in the Qur'ān: “And whoever is killed, We have given his heir the authority [to demand *qiṣāṣ* or forgive or take blood money]. But let him not exceed the limits” (17:33). The word *mawlā* described the

reciprocal relationship between the freed slave who became the client (*mawlā*) of the former master who had freed him, and who was now his patron (*mawlā*).² Sometimes in both the pre-Islamic and Islamic times *walī* was used in a similar sense. Thus, *walī* and *mawlā* describe Allāh's relationship with the believers in terms of Him being their guardian and supporter.

The Qur'ān frequently encourages believers not to take unbelievers as *awliyā'*. "Let not the believers take the disbelievers as *awliyā'* instead of the believers" (3:28).

"And if any amongst you takes them as *awliyā'*, then surely he is one of them" (5:51). "O, you who believe! Take not for *awliyā'* your fathers and brothers if they prefer disbelief" (9:23). Here *awliyā'* has a double interpretation: that the believers should not put themselves in a position where the unbelievers have authority over them, and that the believers should not associate with unbelievers in religion and the latter's opposition to Islam. The Qur'ān also frequently calls upon the believers to be the *awliyā'* of one another.

The believers, men and women, are *awliyā'* of one another: they enjoin good and forbid people to do evil. They perform the prayers give the *zakāt*, and obey Allāh and His Messenger. Allāh will have His mercy on them. Surely Allāh is Almighty, all Wise (9:71).

To interpret it from another angle it can be said that the believers should allow only believers to have authority over one another and the believers should support and protect one another.³

The Ibāḍī concept of *walāyah* is directly related to the Qur'ān when it calls upon the believers to be the *awliyā'* of one another. By this they seem to understand that "sincere Muslims" should associate only with one another for religion and mutual support.⁴ In this way the concept of *walāyah* becomes the fundamental definition of relationships within the Ibāḍī community. The Ibāḍīs are the *awliyā'* of one another in religion and mutual support. They are the "associates" of one another. Members of the Ibāḍī community can be associated in this sense only with one another, not with outsiders.⁵

Ibāḍīs in other words, describe their relationship with the rest of the world as one of dissociation (*barā'ah*): they renounce it. At the extreme level of this dissociation are the polytheists (*mushrikūn*). However, all other Muslims are dissociated from them because, by their beliefs and behaviour, they are unbelievers (*kuffār*) in the sense that they have rejected and been ungrateful for Allāh's favours and laws (*kufṛ al-ni'mah*).

⁶ In support of this belief, Ibāḍīs cite the Qur'ān:

Indeed there has been an excellent example for you in Abraham and those with him, when they said to their people: Verily, we are free from you and whatever you worship besides Allāh; we have rejected you, and there has started between you and us hostility and hatred forever until you believe in Allāh alone" (60: 4-6).⁷

They also cite *Sūrah* 9, which is sometimes called "*Sūrat al-Barā'ah*." In the first verse, it declares: "Dissociation is declared by Allāh and His Messenger by those polytheists with whom you have made a treaty" (9:1).⁸ The Qur'ān also says: "Then if they disobey, say, 'I dissociate myself from what you do'" (26:216).⁹

In support of this concept of dissociation, many verses from the Qur'ān can be cited which command believers not to take unbelievers as associates. The Ibādī scholars ruled that whoever associated himself with a polytheist was a polytheist and whoever associated with a hypocrite (*munāfiq*) was also like him. Such a person had committed a grave sin (*kabīrah*) and he had no place in the Ibādī community until he returned to the right path.¹⁰ The Ibādī scholars quoted the following *aḥādīth* from the Prophet to show how *barā'ah* should be applied. "Whoever has cheated us is not one of us and whoever innovated matters in Islam, which are not part of it, and whoever protected the innovator do not belong to us."¹¹ "Whoever is not respectful to our elders and whoever has no mercy for our young, do not belong to us." The great Ibādī traditionist al-Rabī' quoted these *aḥādīth* and said: "The meaning of these *aḥādīth* is *barā'ah*."¹² The great commentator on the *Musnad* of al-Rabī', al-Sālimī, explained: "Whoever carries arms against us is not one of us. He is not following our way because it is the right of a Muslim that his brother should defend him and fight to protect him against his enemy." This is the meaning of *barā'ah*.¹³

Both *walāyah* and *barā'ah* are obligatory for Ibādīs. They maintain that a person can be considered a *walī* if his behaviour and speech are in accordance with the doctrine of the Ibādīs. That can be proved by one of the Ibādīs or by two witnesses. They must report that he has acted justly in his testimony. It may also be confirmed by widespread reputation (*shuhrah*).¹⁴

Ibādīs claim that if it is proved that the *walī* has become *kāfir* or if he has committed a grave sin, then they must dissociate themselves from him. If one accepts the disbelief of another person, then he is no longer a *walī*. This can be proved by witnessing the behaviour or the speech of that person or from widespread reputation (*shuhrah*) or by the testimony of two witnesses. If a person continues to commit minor sins, then he is included in the category of *barā'ah*.

The Ibādīs extend their interpretation of *walāyah* to religion, that its *al-walāyah al-ḥaqiqiyah*.¹⁵ This means association with Allāh and His Prophet and with all the prophets and messengers that are mentioned by name in the Qur'ān and Sunnah like Adam, Noah, Ṣāliḥ, Abraham etc.¹⁶ It includes those who were mentioned in the Qur'ān by their attributes, like the people of the cave and the people of the ditch, or by their names like Maryam bint 'Imrān and the wife of the Pharaoh. These are well known as believers with whom Muslims can associate.¹⁷

On the other hand, Ibādīs have a concept of *barā'ah* which is known as *al-barā'ah al-ẓāhirah*. This imposes enmity and hostility towards those mentioned by name in the Qur'ān, like Pharaoh and Abū Lahab, and those who are not mentioned by name, like the king who used to seize every ship by force, the wife of Lot, the wife of Abū Lahab who carried wood, and the wife of Noah. Muslims must dissociate themselves from them and acknowledge that they will be in hellfire.¹⁸

Ibāḍī theoreticians have developed a half-way house between outright *barā'ah* and *walāyah*. This is known as *barā'at al-wuqūf*.¹⁹ It is a suspension of judgement over whether a person is a *walī* or not. No judgement should be passed on a person's beliefs until they are known from firm evidence. This situation is known as *wuqūf al-dīn*.²⁰ Within the Ibāḍī community, when a member who was a *walī* has now become suspect without there being any firm evidence against him and without him being questioned, he is entitled to a suspension of judgement. This is known as *wuqūf al-ra'y*.²¹ When there is a dispute between Ibāḍīs over an issue and it is not known who is right because there is no immediate authority to ask, there should be a suspension of judgement until it is possible to seek advice. This is known as *wuqūf al-su'āl*.²² When two Muslim parties have dispute with each other and it is not known who is right, then there should be a similar suspension of judgement until the truth is made clear. This is known as *wuqūf al-ishkāl*.²³ When Ibāḍīs themselves disagree over the legitimacy of the Imamate and it is not known which party is right, there should be a suspension of judgement until the situation becomes clear. This is known as *wuqūf al-shakk*.²⁴

If the Imam is an Ibāḍī, then Muslims can associate with him, but if he becomes unjust, they must dissociate from him. An Ibāḍī scholar, 'Alī b. 'Umar said: "If an Imam is appointed in a country, one should not be associated with him unless two witnesses confirm that he is a just Imam and has been appointed." Ibn Rawḥ said: "The *walāyah* and *barā'ah* of the Imams must be known and whichever of them supports the Muslims in his behaviour and speech and leads a good life, then his

walāyah is compulsory.”²⁵ If the Imam appears not to support the Muslims and he has acted unjustly and deviated in his way of life, then the Muslims must dissociate themselves from him. If the Imam has appointed to carry out certain tasks someone whose past behaviour appears to have been that of *kufī* Ibādīs differ in their judgement as follows:²⁶

1. If the Imam knows the conditions of *walāyah* and *barā'ah*, then it is essential for the Muslims to be associated with the person appointed because the Imam can be trusted to protect religion.
2. The Muslims must suspend judgement because the Imam might have appointed that person after his repentance.
3. If the Imam is still a *walī*, the person whom he has appointed can be subjected to dissociation until his repentance is confirmed. Then he will receive his *hukm*.
4. If the Imam has used him for a post the like of which is normally carried out by a person who is not a *walī*, then the rule is that he can retain that status because that will come under two categories: If the person is appointed to carry out duties based on trust (*amānah*), then that is not acceptable until he has repented, especially if he is in charge of the matter. However if he is under the supervision and guidance of other administrators, that will not do any harm, whether or not he has

committed sins and repented, because it is not legal to renounce the Imam until he deserve to be killed.

The concepts of *walāyah* and *barā'ah* provide the Ibādīs with the bases of their relationships both inside and outside the Ibādī community. *Walāyah* knits the Ibādī community together while *barā'ah* enables the Ibādīs to remove from it those who have not met their standards. At the same time it is the basis of the Ibādīs' relationships with those who are not Ibādīs.

¹ *E.I.*, vol. IV.

² *E.I.*, vol. III.

³ Al-Jiṭālī, Abū Ṭahir Isma'īl b. Mūsā, *Qanāṭir al-Khayrat*, Oman, 1989, vol. I, 254.

⁴ Al-Jiṭālī, Abū Ṭahir Isma'īl b. Mūsā, *Qawā'id al-Islām*, Oman, 1992, vol. I, 48.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 68.

⁶ They did not fulfil the duties of Islam and were not in total agreement with the Ibādī interpretation. This concept is stated by 'Abd Allāh b. Ibād and is still followed.

⁷ Al-Jiṭālī, *Qawā'id al-Islām*, vol. I, 50.

⁸ Jamīl b. Khamīs Al-Sa'adī, *Qāmūs al-Sharīah*, Oman, 1983, vol. IX, 7.

⁹ *Idem.*

¹⁰ Al-Sa'adī, 10; al-Jiṭālī, *Qawā'id al-Islām*, vol. I, 70.

¹¹ Narrated by al-Rabī', *ḥadīth* no. 753, 199.

¹² *Idem.*

¹³ *Idem.*

¹⁴ Al-Jiṭālī, *Qawā'id al-Islām*, vol. I, 65.

¹⁵ Al-Kudamī, *al-Istiḳāmah*, vol I, 13.

¹⁶ Al-Sa'adī, *Qāmūs al-Sharīah*, vol. VIII, 102.

¹⁷ Al-Kudamī, *al-Istiḳāmah*, vol. I, 13-7.

¹⁸ Al-Jiṭālī, *Qawā'id al-Islām*, vol. I, 80.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 90.

²⁰ Al-Kindī, Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, *Bayan al-Shar'*, vol. III, 87.

²¹ *Idem.*

²² *Idem*; al-Kudamī, al-Mu'tabr, vol. I, 158.

²³ Al-Kudamī, al-Mu'tabr, vol. I, 158.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 97.

²⁵ Al-Sa'adī, Jamīl b. Khamīs, *Qāmūs al-Sharīah*, vol. VIII, 101.

²⁶ Abū Bakr al-Kindī, al-Muṣannaf, vol. VIII, 178- 81.

II

THE PATHS OF RELIGION (*MASĀLIK AL-DĪN*)

Ibāḍīs view their political and religious situation in the light of what they term as the paths of religion (*masālik al-dīn*). These describe the situation in relationship to the appointment of an Imam, the way in which Ibāḍīs should conduct themselves and the stages by which their Imamate is to be achieved. These are the stages in which Ibāḍī society evolves to create an Ibāḍī Imam. Ibāḍīs determine their political position according to the different circumstances in which Ibāḍī communities exist. By following these paths, Ibāḍīs intend to establish an Islamic state based on the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. If the Imamate is not achieved at the end of each path (*maslak*), then there are rules and principles which govern the Ibāḍī community and its own conduct in the meantime.¹

The paths are:

1. The path of secrecy (*kitmān*).
2. The path of sacrifice (*shirā'*).
3. The path of defence (*difā'*).
4. The path stage of manifestation (*ẓuhūr*).

I shall explain in detail the laws and principles that apply to each path. The path of secrecy (*kitmān*) requires *taqiyyah*, which will be explained after the discussion of the path of secrecy. The final path, in which the Ibādīs proclaim an independent Imamate, will be examined in greater detail in chapter 10.

The path of secrecy (*kitmān*)

This means that the Ibādī community is working in secret to achieve power for its member. The Ibādī scholars describe this as “ the lowest form of *jihād* for the Ibādīs.”² They keep their beliefs secret to avoid suppression by their enemies and they accept humiliation and government by tyrants (*ṭughāt*).³ They do not openly manifest their views but strive to keep themselves safe.⁴

When Ibādīs are at this stage, they are shrouded in secrecy. This means they become isolated and separated from corrupt society. They direct their activities towards their internal affairs.⁵ It is well known by the Ibādī community that this path of secrecy was followed by most of its members from the time of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib until that of ‘Abd Allāh b. Yaḥyā.⁶ Thus *kitmān* lasted for 97 years at the beginning of Islamic history, yet the need for *kitmān* may occur at any time.⁷

Ibādīs see this path of secrecy (*kitmān*) as the most expedient to follow when they are weak and powerless. They consider that when disobedience to Allāh prevails and the unjust (*bāṭil*) hold sway, then it is essential for Ibādīs to remain concealed.

This path requires a very strict and secret organisation to handle Ibāḍī affairs. It is also flexible so that they do not actually give in to tyranny. They also try to build their organisation and train themselves to take power whenever the opportunity arises.⁸

This stage of *kitmān* imposes absolute secrecy on Ibāḍīs. Although it was called an Imamate, it appears that the Imam or leader was not selected but emerged through his knowledge of and dedication to the movement and his ability to organise. These determined the position for him. The Imamate at this stage was like the leader of a secret organisation and it was called *imāmat al-kitmān*.

Precautionary dissimulation (*taqiyyah*)

During the period of secrecy (*kitmān*), Ibāḍīs used *taqiyyah* to protect themselves. This means that they conceal their beliefs to avoid suppression by their enemies.

Ibāḍī regard *taqiyyah* in the following way. If a tyrant kills those who do not agree that his religion is the true one and if an Ibāḍī judges for himself that he will be killed, then the Ibāḍī can say with his tongue what the tyrant demands to hear, but he must hate it in his heart and contradict it when he can. If an Ibāḍī is in fear of being badly beaten and that the beating might cause him serious harm, he can acknowledge what he is told by an unbeliever who is a tyrant.⁹ However, an Ibāḍī must not voluntarily praise the tyrant or tell him that he is right or that his religion is the true one.

Ibāḍī scholars also discussed another situation relating to wealth. They assumed that a tyrant wanted to take the wealth of a certain individual if he did not praise him. However, if the tyrant took that wealth, that would cause hardship or even death to that individual and his children. Therefore, that person must praise the tyrant to save himself and his children. However, if the taking of that wealth would not cause serious harm to him and his children, then he must not praise the tyrant to save his wealth.¹⁰

Some Ibāḍī scholars even argued for the lawfulness of praising unbelievers voluntarily to save Ibāḍīs' wealth. They told a story from the life of the Prophet. It was that the Prophet gave permission to al-Ḥajjāj b. 'Iyyād to go to Mecca to tell the people there that the Prophet had been defeated at Khaybar, so that they would allow al-Ḥajjāj to collect his money from there safely. However, the majority of Ibāḍī scholars rejected this understanding, saying that the Prophet did not allow him to attack Islam or accuse the Prophet of any wrong conduct. What al-Ḥajjāj told the Meccans to save himself and his money was only that Muḥammad has been defeated in Khaybar. Thus, he was not slandering the Prophet or praising the Meccans voluntarily.¹¹

Another assumption made by Ibāḍī scholars was that if an Ibāḍī were told by a tyrant (*jabbār*) to collect land tax (*kharāj*) from the people, he must avoid doing so. However, if he collected any *kharāj*, he must give a guarantee to repay it to the people.¹² If an Ibāḍī were ordered by a tyrant to kill somebody or to beat him, he was

not allowed to do so because he could not save himself by killing others. Something less than life could save a life but not life itself. If an Ibāḍī were told to drink wine and eat the meat of an animal that was not slaughtered in accordance with Islamic law, he was allowed to do that if he feared being killed or severely beaten. This was justified from the Qur'ān: "But as for him who is forced by severe hunger with no inclination to sin, he can eat these meats, then surely, Allāh is oft-Forgiving, most Merciful" (6:145). And the Qur'ān also says: "But whoever is forced by necessity without wilful disobedience, nor transgressing due limits, for him certainly your Lord is oft-Forgiving, most Merciful" (2:173).¹³ By acting like this, according to Ibāḍī scholars, he was excused by Allāh as long as his heart was not committing a sin.

If an Ibāḍī were forced to tell lies against another Muslim and accuse Muslim women of fornication, was it lawful for him to do that? It was lawful for him if he would be killed or suffer a severe beating for telling the truth. This kind of lying was lawful because of necessity, according to what Allāh said: "Except him who is forced thereto and whose heart is at rest with faith" (16:106).¹⁴ This seems rather inconsistent because a woman accused of fornication may face a flogging or even death. However, if an Ibāḍī is forced to commit adultery or be killed, he must not commit adultery because that would be unjust to the woman who would be subjected to it. A Muslim cannot do an unjust thing to others to save himself because such an act is a grave sin and brings shame on the woman.¹⁵

If one of the Ibāḍīs is captured by the enemy, who requests a ransom to free him, the Imam must pay that ransom from the treasury. However, if the Ibāḍīs have no Imam

they must collect the money to free him unless that ransom is very high and it will weaken and destroy them. In that case the Ibādī can be killed to protect the rest.¹⁶

According to Ibādī *fiqh* the legal aspect of *taqiyyah* falls into three categories:¹⁷

1. Obligatory (*farḍ*): If the Ibādī is fearful of harming his faith, he must use *taqiyyah* to protect his religion
2. Optional (*tawassu'*): This is when the Ibādī fears that he will be killed or that his wealth will be taken. In this situation he has the choice of whether to take Allāh's excuse or to continue in the way of Allāh until he dies and to receive Allāh's best reward.
3. Forbidden (*ḥarām*): This when an Ibādī might be in jeopardy although there is no danger to his life and property. However, he would be wrong if he used *taqiyyah* in this situation and would be a sinner.

The main Qur'ānic support for *taqiyyah* quoted by the Ibādīs is: "Let not the believers take for patrons (*awliyā'*) or helpers unbelievers rather than believers; if any do that, in nothing will there be help from Allāh, except by the way of precaution that you may guard yourselves from them"(3:28). This verse was revealed about 'Ammār b. Yāsir when he was forced to pronounce something, which was considered *kufṛ*. However, Allāh excused him and the Prophet told 'Ammār that if they did punish him, he could say the same thing. Another Qur'ānic support for *taqiyyah* is the verse: "Whoever disbelieved in Allah after his belief, except him who is forced thereto and whose heart is at rest with the Faith"(16:106). Allāh has made

taqiyyah lawful with this verse. Some Ibāḍīs claim that whoever has no *taqiyyah* has no religion (*dīn*).¹⁸

The path of sacrifice (*shirā'*)

This is the act of sacrificing one's own life in revolt against a tyrannical regime. This is based on the Qur'ānic verse: "And of mankind is he who would sell himself, seeking the pleasure of Allāh" (2:207). Ibāḍīs also quote the Qur'ānic verse: "Verily, Allāh has purchased of the believers their lives and their properties for the price that theirs shall be Paradise" (11:111). A group of Ibāḍīs, consisting of forty or more, sold their lives for the sake of Allāh in accordance with the meaning of verse 2:207, which means that forty trustworthy and religious people had sold their lives to Allāh.¹⁹ The outstanding example of this is Abū Bilāl, who, together with forty men, rebelled against the Umayyads in 61 A.H. They were prepared to sacrifice their lives rather than submit to tyranny.²⁰

Ibāḍīs claim that *shirā'* is the action most loved by Allāh if the Ibāḍīs are unable to achieve the full Imamate.²¹ The Ibāḍī scholars did not rule that *shirā'* was compulsory, but left it to the people to decide for themselves: either to seek the pleasure of Allāh or to remain in secret. The Ibāḍīs never criticised either those who rebelled or those who remained in secret.²² Thus, different Ibāḍīs could be following the path of *kitmān* and *shirā'* at the same time as did Jābir b. Zayd and Abū Bilāl.

The leader of any group that committed itself to *shirā'* was the Imam of sacrifice and his authority was over those who committed themselves to sacrifice with him, not over those who remained in *kitmān*. The main objective of this form of Imamate was to wage *jihād* against the authority of a tyrant.²³ When they pledged *shirā'*, they were not allowed to return home until their number was reduced to three people.²⁴ This was an organisation against unjust government to stop them from carrying out its unjust plans. Although it would not achieve its target, it would keep a tyrant in fear and unrest and distract him from his plans and from living in comfort.²⁵ This group intended to cause unrest by destroying castles and bridges, and stopping caravans and cutting their communications.²⁶ Most of the early revolts after al-Nahrawān were of this kind. The aim of the Ibādīs was to accomplish some of their objectives towards establishing a full Imamate by using force against the unjust.

The Ibādī who committed himself to *shirā'* had to fulfil the following conditions:

1. He was not allowed to return home after he rebelled if his group numbered more than three,²⁷ with the exception of coming back for supplies.
2. He was considered to be a travelling stranger, never staying in one place, but constantly moving from one place to another, enjoining good and forbidding what was wrong.²⁸
3. He was never allowed to scare anybody except the tyrant and his soldiers.

4. He had to carry out the objectives of *shirā'* until either the aims were accomplished or he died.²⁹

Shirā' is one of the most distinguished commitments of the Ibādīs.³⁰

When the Ibādīs wanted to establish this form of Imamate, they gathered in one place, and anyone who had the intention of *shirā'* would pledge allegiance to the Imam. The form of the allegiance was as follows: "We pledge allegiance to obey Allāh and His Prophet, and enjoin good and forbid wrong." Once they had done this it was illegal for them to withdraw until they had achieved their objectives or died or there were only three of them left. When the Imam was appointed as *al-shā'irī*, his Imamate continued and it was illegal to depose him unless he committed a grave sin and refused to repent.³¹ This crime must be known to the majority of the people. This Imam must strive in the way of Allāh until he died, or, if his group was reduced to fewer than three, he could return to the path of *kitmān*, and practise *taqiyyah* and become an ordinary person again.³²

The path of defence (*difā'*)

This represents a stage prior to the establishment of a full Imamate. It was a path followed when the Ibādīs felt that Islam was being undermined and that they needed to defend themselves against their enemy if they were attacked or feared being

attacked. At this stage they would appoint an Imam of defence (*difā'*).³³ It was a duty of this Imam to defend the Ibāḍīs with his life. It was the Ibāḍīs' task to support him, obey him and follow his example in defence and battle.³⁴

Difā' involved rebelling against those who had deviated from religion (*dīn*) in any way and caused corruption (*fasād*). The leader of this revolution was called the Imam of defence (*imām al-difā'*). "It is the duty of the Ibāḍīs to obey this leader as long as the revolution continues."³⁵

When the Ibāḍīs wanted to select the Imam of defence, there was discussion among the scholars, which was called a council (*shūrā*), before a decision was made. Then the most knowledgeable scholars among them went forward to the selected Imam and pledged allegiance to him, followed by the rest of the scholars. They announced to the people that they had selected an Imam and told them to pledge allegiance³⁶ to him.³⁷ The Imam then took a covenant from the people to obey him and support him as long as the war should last.³⁸

The pledge of allegiance to the defence (*ṣighat bay'at al-difā'*), was as follows:

"We pledge allegiance to you for the sake of Allāh, a pledge which contains truth (*ṣidq*) and fulfilment (*wafā'*) for us and all the Muslims; [a pledge] to obey Allāh and his Messenger, to forbid wrong and enjoin good, to make *jihād* for the sake of Allāh in the way of defence, and to follow the example of just Imams."³⁹

If the Imam achieved his aim and succeeded in defending the Ibāḍīs, then the stage of the Imamate of defence was over and the Imam himself returned to being an

ordinary individual.⁴⁰ The Ibāḍīs could select him or anyone else as full Imam, for his mission was over at this stage. If the Imam failed to reach his goal or his followers deserted him, then he could return to the path of *kitmān* and adopt *taqiyyah*. The Ibāḍīs would return to the stage of *kitmān*⁴¹ or they could choose to go on to the stage of *shirā'*. An example of the Imam of defence was 'Abd Allāh b. Wabḥ al-Rāsibī.⁴² At first he was an Imam of defence but later adopted the path of sacrifice and became an Imām of sacrifice (*shirā'*).

The path of manifestation (*ẓuhur*)

This is the most important of the paths of religion (*masālik al-dīn*) within the Ibāḍī community. It means the achievement of an independent Imamate and it is the final stage after the three previous Imamates, *kitman*, *shirā'* and *difa'*. It is the ultimate aim for which the Ibāḍīs strive. For them it means the establishment of an Islamic government which rules according to the *Shari'ah* and the Sunnah of the Prophet. The form of this Imamate will be discussed in the next chapter.

¹ 'Addūn Jahlān, *al-Fikr al-Siyāsī 'ind al-Ibāḍīyyah*, Oman, 1990, 164.

² *Idem*.

- ³ Al-Hashimī, 32.
- ⁴ ‘Alī Mu‘ammar, *al-Ibāḍiyyah fī Mawḳib al-Ta’rīkh*, Oman, 1993, vol. I, 94.
- ⁵ Abū ‘Ubaydah, *Sirat Abū ‘Ubaydah ila ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Rustum, al-Siyar wa al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, 323.
- ⁶ See chapter 7 for details of Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq.
- ⁷ Abū Bakr Aḥmad al-Kindī, *Kitāb al-Muṣannaf*, vol. VIII, Oman, 1985, 52.
- ⁸ Jahlān, 164.
- ⁹ Abū Muḥammad Ibn Barakah, *Kitāb al-Jāmi‘*, Oman, n.d, 189.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 191.
- ¹¹ *Idem.*
- ¹² *Idem.*
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 192.
- ¹⁴ *Idem.*
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 193.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 195.
- ¹⁷ Al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. VIII, 259.
- ¹⁸ *Idem.*
- ¹⁹ Al-Kindī, 51.
- ²⁰ Mardas b. Ḥadīr was regarded by the Ibāḍīs as one of their leaders. When a dispute occurred between him and Ibn Ziyād, he rebelled but did not kill or take wealth. Khalifāh b. Khayāt, 256.
- ²¹ Muḥammad Yusuf, Aṭṭaysh, *Sharḥ al-Nīl*, vol. XIV, 310.
- ²² *Idem.*
- ²³ B. Aghusht, 112.
- ²⁴ *Idem.*
- ²⁵ Mu‘ammar, 94 -5.
- ²⁶ *Idem.*
- ²⁷ Al-Suhīlī, , *al-Ibāḍiyyah fī al-Khalīj*, Kuwait, 1994, 62.
- ²⁸ Mu‘ammar, 95.
- ²⁹ Jahlān, 162.
- ³⁰ Mu‘ammar related this to one of the Ibāḍī scholars - his name was Abū Ishāq.
- ³¹ Abū Bakr Aḥmed b. ‘Abd Allāh l-Kindī, al-Nazwānī, *Kitāb al-Ihtidā’*, ed. S.I. Kashif, Oman, 1985, 85.
- ³² Khamīs b. Sa ‘īd, al-Shaqṣī, *Minḥāj al-Ṭālibīn wa Balāgh al-Raghibīn*, vol. VII, 1993, 73.
- ³³ Al-Suhīlī, 61.
- ³⁴ Aṭṭaysh, vol. XIV/2, 276.
- ³⁵ Mu‘ammar, 94.
- ³⁶ Muḥammad b. Sa‘īd al-Kudamī, *al-Istiḳāmah*, Oman, 1985, vol. II, 98.

³⁷ This procedure was carried out during the selection of Rashid b. al-Walīd in Nizwa in the 4th century A.H. This Imam was killed in 363 A.H. (see *Tuḥfat al-A'yān*, 285; and *al-Istiqāmah*, 97).

³⁸ *Idem*.

³⁹ Al-Kudamī, *al-Istiqāmah*, vol. II, 97-8; Aṭṭaysh, vol. VIX/1, 97-99.

⁴⁰ Mu'ammār, vol. I, 94.

⁴¹ Al-Kudamī, vol. II, 100.

⁴² He was an example of sacrifice for the Ibādī community.

III

THE IBĀDĪ IMAMATE

The importance and necessity of the Imamate

Ibādī scholars consider the Imamate a very important blessing from Allāh. The best two favours (*ni'ma*) given to Muslims were the message of the Prophet Muḥammad and having a just Imam.¹ In support of this they quote the Qur'ān: "And we made from among them leaders, giving guidance under our command, when they were patient and used to believe with certainty in our evidence" (92:24).² They maintained that this verse indicates the importance of leaders to the community, especially those who follow the guidance of Allāh and applying the laws revealed by Allāh.

Ibādī scholars³ cite another verse which points out the importance of the Imam: "'Verily, I am going to make you an Imam for mankind to follow you.' Ibrahim said: 'And of my offspring?' Allāh said: 'My covenant does not include wrongdoers'" (2:124). Ibādīs understand from this verse that the Imamate cannot be given to a tyrant or an unjust ruler because of its importance and essential role in protecting the community and its interests.⁴ They quote a tradition from the Prophet, in which he said: "The just Imam is in the shade of the throne on the Day of Judgment."⁵ Even though Ibādīs have always been against a tyrannical Imam, al-Kindī reported from the

Prophet: "The tyrant (*jabbār*) Imam is better than affliction (*fitnah*)."⁶ This indicates the importance of the Imamate to the Ibādīs. They also reported that the Prophet said:

The best of your leaders [Imams] are those whom you love, and who love you, and those upon whom you invoke blessings and who invoke blessings upon you. The worst of your leaders are those whom you hate and who hate you, and those whom you curse and who curse you.⁷

The just Imam, according to the Ibādīs, is the one who rules in accordance with the Qur'ān and the Sunnah of the Prophet and is just in distributing wealth among the people,⁸ whereas the misguided Imam follows his own lust and desires.⁹

Ibādīs see that it is necessary for Muslims to establish an Imamate and appoint an Imam to run the affairs of state in accordance with the *sharī'ah* because Allāh says: "Remember the day when we shall call together all human beings with their Imam."¹⁰ For that reason the Imamate is one of the ordained duties of religion (*dīn*): it is an obligation and a collective duty (*farḍ kifāyah*), that is, if it is established by a group of people, the obligation is fulfilled and the rest are exempted from that responsibility.¹¹

Ibādī scholars state that the Imamate is necessary (*farḍ*) according to the Qur'ān, the Sunnah of the Prophet and *ijmā'*. They cite the following verses from the Qur'ān as confirmation:

1. "And We made from among them leaders, giving guidance under Our command" (32:24).¹²

2. “ ‘Verily, I am going to make you an Imam for mankind.”

Ibrahim said: ‘And of my offspring?’ Allāh said: “My covenant does not includes wrong-doers” (2:124).¹³

3. “O, you who believe! Obey Allāh and obey the Messenger and those of you who are in authority” (4:59).¹⁴

These verses show that the Qur’ān confirmed the necessity of the Imamate. It is compulsory for Muslims to carry out the orders of Allāh because it is stated in the Qur’ān: “and whatsoever the Messenger gives you, take it, and whatsoever he forbids you, abstain from it”(59:7).¹⁵ These verses indicate that the Messenger must be obeyed. The Messenger orders the Muslims to obey those who are in authority.

Ibādī scholars cited the following *aḥādīth* in support of this:

1. The Prophet said: “Obey those in authority from among you.”¹⁶

2. The Prophet told Mu ‘ādh b. Jabal “Do not disobey the just Imam.”¹⁷

3. The Prophet said: “Hear and obey even though your *amīr* be an Abyssinian (*ḥabshī*) slave with crinkled hair.”¹⁸

From the above *aḥādīth* it is clear that the Prophet ordered Muslims to obey the just Imam because obedience is due only to the way of righteousness. The Ibādīs also reported that the Prophet said: “No obedience is due to him who does not obey Allāh and who rebels against Allāh.”¹⁹

From the Prophet's practice, scholars pointed out that when the Prophet conquered a new territory he appointed an *amīr* for that region or country. If he left Medina for the pilgrimage or for any other reason, he appointed an *amīr*. "If he appointed an *amīr* at that time, it is more essential to have an Imam after his death."²⁰ The Prophet said: "The just Imams will be in the shade of the throne."²¹ So it is necessary to have a just Imam because the Imams are caliphs over the Muslims and witnesses for them on the Day of Judgment.²²

Ibāḍīs agreed that there was a consensus (*ijmā'*) that there should be an Imam. This *ijmā'* is understood from the actions of *Muhajirīn* and *Anṣār* when they disputed after the death of the Prophet about who should be the *amīr*.²³ Their dispute was not about the legality or the necessity of the Imamate, but about who was supposed to be the Imam. Thus, their selection was an *ijmā'* in favour of establishing the Imamate.²⁴ The scholars also pointed out that Allāh had prescribed (*faraḍ*) the compulsory action (*furūḍ*) and revealed punishments (*ḥadd - ḥūdud*) for the people. These punishments would not be valid without a leader to carry them out.²⁵

One of the Ibāḍī scholars²⁶ said:

An army cannot be equipped for a war, a *ḥadd* cannot be applied, and a person who is afraid cannot be protected unless there is an Imamate. It is a duty (*wājib*) for it to be established when it is possible."²⁷

Ibāḍīs maintained that the Prophet had established the Muslim state and had ordered the Muslims to obey the Imam. After the death of the Prophet the Muslims selected Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Thus, we had to follow the Sunnah of the Prophet and his way in whatever he did.²⁸ The Imamate was to be established by the consensus of the scholars and the agreement of the *ummah*.²⁹

The conditions for the Imam (*shurūṭ al-Imām*)

The scholars laid down the following conditions for the Imam:

1. The Imam must be a Muslim, a freeman (*ḥurr*), male, and have reached the age of puberty. The condition of Islam was essential because the role of the Imam was to safeguard the religion (*dīn*) of Allāh, to apply it and carry out the orders of Allāh and His Prophet, and to prevent people from violating the law of Allāh. The Imam had to be a freeman because a slave was not eligible to run his own affairs, so he would fail to undertake the Imamate properly. The Ibāḍīs ruled that a slave was not acceptable because he did not maintain his own affairs.³⁰ To be male was a condition laid down by the Ibāḍīs because a woman was not allowed to be an Imam. They cited the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet: “Those who put their affairs into the hands of women will not prosper or be successful.”³¹ It was very important to have reached the age of puberty because a juvenile was not fully responsible for his actions. Thus, he could not be an Imam and run the affairs of the *ummah*. Al-

Kindī said: “The Imam must have reached the age of puberty in order to be mentally fit (‘*aql*) and capable of discretion (*mumayyiz*).”³²

2. The Imam must possess the quality of justice (‘*adālah*). Therefore he should perform the obligatory actions abstain, from all wrongdoing and avoid sin.³³ The Imam must be devoted, sincere, ascetic (*zāhid*) and look forward to the Hereafter.
3. The Imam must have knowledge. This was necessary to run the Imamate and conduct its affairs. The Ibādīs state that the Imam must be the best among those who were eligible to be selected for the post.³⁴
4. The Imam must be capable of managing people and administrative matters. He should be knowledgeable about government politics and he should be an expert in running Muslims’ affairs.³⁵
5. The Imam must be firm and courageous. The Ibādīs select an Imam for his obedience to Allāh, not his obedience to them. Thus, he must be the strongest among them in enjoining good and forbidding wrong. He must be the one who fights the enemy and protects the land, the women and children. He must secure the interests of everyone and defend the country.³⁶
6. He must have good hearing, eyesight and speech. He must not have any deficiency in his limbs which might prevent him from waging *jihād*. The Imam must not be insane (*majnūn*) or mentally retarded (*ma’tūh*).³⁷

7. The Imam must be from the Quraysh. This was one of the most problematic conditions for the Ibādīs and was rejected by many of them. The Muslim schools of *fiqh* disputed this condition because of the interpretation of the meaning of the *ḥadīth*: “The Imams are from the Quraysh.”

The Ibādī scholar, al-Rabī‘, narrated the following *ḥadīths* related to the Imamate of the Quraysh:

1. “This matter is one for the Quraysh as long as there are two of them remaining. But it is wrong to cause discord by their authority.”³⁸
2. “This matter will be among you. You will hold it until you indulge in wrong-doing (*aḥdāth*). Then Allāh will send the worst people to destroy You like a branch.”³⁹

Ibādīs put the condition of Qurayshī origin in the following context. The previous *aḥādīth* did not limit the caliphate to the Quraysh because they considered that this might contradict the reasons why the caliphate was established. The Caliphate was not assigned to a group of people, whether they were just or unjust, corrupt or followers of the straight path. The scholars argued that the previous *aḥādīth* did not specify the caliphate as an institution. The second *ḥadīth* did not even specify the Quraysh. They pointed out that it was reported that the Muslims must obey an Imam even if he is an Abyssinian slave. They also argued that if it had been established that the Imamate was for the Quraysh it would never have been demanded by the *Anṣārī*

during the occasion of Saqīfah. They maintained that Abū Bakr's argument was not about the necessity of the Imam being from the Quraysh but was a necessity at that time. The people would not obey anyone except the Qurayshī because of their current position.⁴⁰ If the Imam had been appointed from another group, a dispute would have occurred among the Muslims. The Quraysh deserved to be Imams at that time⁴¹ and obedience to the Quraysh was required only while they practiced justice. This period finished when the caliphate became a kingship (*mulk*).⁴² However, some Ibādī scholars recognise the existence of the requirement for a Qurayshī Imam but interpret it as a preference (*afḍaliyyah*).⁴³

It can be concluded that Ibādīs accepted requirement for a Qurashī Imam if he were just and followed the Qur'ān and the Sunnah of the Prophet. That condition applied only for a certain period and it was not a prerequisite for an Imamate at any other time.

The Imam is required to apply Islam and follow its teachings like any other Muslim. His first responsibility is to establish Islam among the *ummah*. Although he is one of the Muslims, with the same rights and obligations, he has the right to use his authority to make anything lawful or unlawful. However, the conduct of the Imam himself must be in accordance with the Qur'ān.⁴⁴ The Imam must look to himself first and put his life in order, comply fully with the Qur'ān and fear Allāh, in both private and public life, in both word and deed.⁴⁵

The duties of the Imam

The duties of the Imam are:

1. The protection of the religion (*ḥifẓ al-dīn*). This is achieved by applying its laws and respecting its limits, by punishing those who neglect its teachings and any of the aims of the *sharīʿah*. He has to protect religion (*dīn*), life (*nafs*), children (*nasl*), wealth (*māl*) and the intellect (*ʿaql*).⁴⁶ The Ibāḍīs state the following as the Imam's responsibility: "To protect the religion by not introducing any innovation into it and by acting in accordance with it without any neglect."⁴⁷
2. To protect public safety (*amān*). This means to protect the country (*ḥirasat al-bayḍah*) and defend it from all enemies in religion, and from those who are seeking to take the lives or wealth of others. It is the responsibility of the Imam to defend the country and the people against any danger, whether internal or external. That is his main responsibility from which he cannot escape.⁴⁸
3. To maintain justice, which means to treat people equally, and solve any dispute by establishing courts for that purpose and to apply the revealed punishments: "To apply justice between people equally, to be

fair to everybody, to carry out the revealed punishments on those who have committed crimes and deserve punishment, without exceeding the limits or being lenient.”⁴⁹

4. To appoint judges governors and officials. The Ibādīs placed conditions on those who were appointed by the Imam. They must be qualified for the job, trustworthy (*thiqah*), just (*‘adl*) and fit for the job.⁵⁰ The Ibādīs quoted the words of ‘Umar:

I did not send those *‘ummāl* to the people to beat them, nor to make any false accusations, or to take their wealth, or to prevent them from entering their homes, but I have sent them to collect their *fay*’ for them and to defend them against their enemies. They are to be just to the people and teach them the Qur’ān, to take *ṣadaqāt* from the wealthy and distribute it among the poor and to be fair to the people of the Book (*ahl al-dhimmah*). If anyone complains about his *amīr*, I shall take his rights from him.⁵¹

Ibādīs have tried to follow in the footsteps of ‘Umar in establishing their Imamate by emphasising justice and equality for every Ibādī. If the Imam appoints any unjust or unqualified person then they consider that he has committed a sin. That is regarded as wrong conduct on the part of the Imam and could result in his removal.

5. Management of financial affairs. It is the obligation of the Imam to develop the financial resources of the *ummah* and ensure that it is distributed according to the law of the *sharī‘ah*, whether these resources are *zakāt* or *fay*’ or natural resources, and to divide the *ṣadaqāt* and give it to the poor.⁵²

6. Social responsibility. The Ibādī Imam has to look after the people and be socially active. He should visit the sick and attend the funerals of the deceased.⁵³ The Imam should open his house to the people and look after the weak (*masākīn*). He must not ask them to do anything beyond their ability. He should behave humbly towards the people and be close to them.⁵⁴ This is because the Prophet said: “Whoever becomes responsible for any of the Muslims’ affairs must look after their needs and keep them from poverty.”⁵⁵ There is another *ḥadīth* which has the same meaning: “Whoever assumes authority over the Muslims and then does not take care of them as if they were his own family will never enter Paradise.”⁵⁶ Thus, it is understood that the Ibādī Imam is fully responsible and is not excused by appointing others, “because he does not have any immunity and he is responsible for all the decisions taken by him, and must take full responsibility for them.”⁵⁷

The rights of the Imam

The Imam has duties to the people but at the same time the people have responsibilities to the Imam. These are

1. To obey the Imam. This obligation is mentioned in the Qur'ān and the Sunnah of the Prophet. The Qur'ān says: "O you who believe, obey Allāh and obey his Messenger and those of you who are in authority (4:59).⁵⁸ The Qur'ān asks the people to obey the Imam as long as he obeys Allāh and his Messenger, and this is an obligation of the people towards the Imam. Ibādīs emphasise this by citing the following *aḥādīth* from the Prophet. The Prophet said: "Even if you are ruled by an Abyssinian (*ḥabashī*) with crinkly hair, provided that he rules you according to the Book of Allāh and my Sunnah, then listen to him and obey him."⁵⁹ He said: "Do not disobey a just Imam. Obey your rulers."⁶⁰ The pledge that is given by the Ibādīs to the Imam obliges them to obey him and follow his orders. "It is an obligation of the people to obey the just Imam whose authority is extended over them, and they will receive his protection."⁶¹ The Ibādīs are strict about obedience to the Imam, which is considered *wajīb*. Whoever pledges allegiance to an Imam and then breaks his allegiance will be renounced by the Ibādīs.⁶² Obedience to the Imam is in return for the Imam upholding the law and the values of Islam because there is no obedience in sinful matters. The limits of obedience are within the mental and physical capabilities of person. Obedience to the Imam is connected to the Imam's obedience to Allāh and His Prophet,⁶³ and his authority according to the *sharī'ah*. The

people are required to hear and obey during hard times and easy times, in circumstances pleasant and unpleasant.⁶⁴ They must obey the orders of the just Imam.⁶⁵

2. To support the Imam. Muslims must help and support the Imam to protect the community, establish its comfort and protect its interests against any enemies. The Ibādīs state that if the Imam were appointed and he maintained justice, then it was the obligation of society to support him if he requested any help or support.⁶⁶ The legal basis for this requirement is the following verses: “The believers, men and women, are *awliyā*’ of one another” (9:71). “Help one another in virtue and piety but do not help one another in sin and transgression” (5:2).
3. To advise the Imam. The Ibādīs consider that to give advice to the Imam is an obligation, especially if it is for their benefit. They state that if the Imam refuses the advice of the Muslims then his Imamate would fall and they would renounce him.⁶⁷
4. Revolt is not allowed against a just Imam. Neither can the people appoint another Imam. Whoever rebels against a just Imam is an unjust and rebellious person (*baghī*). The people must support the Imam against that group because revolt against the Imam causes dissension and instability.⁶⁸

The role of *shūrā* and the method of selecting the Imam

Ibāḍīs believe that *shūrā* or consultation is the backbone of the Imamate. It is based on the consensus of knowledge people (*ijmā' ahl al-arā'wa-al-'ilm*). On one level this consultation is concerned with the need for the ruler to be advised by the appropriate advisory council. Thus they stated: "*Shūrā* is obligatory for the ruler. If he did not act upon it, he is a disbeliever (*kāfir*), whether he is an expert in government or weak."⁶⁹

They pointed out that the Qur'ān emphasised the principle of *shūrā* in more than one place. Indeed, *surah* 42 in the Qur'ān was called "Surat al-shūrā". In this *surah* a verse states: "And who conduct their affairs by mutual consultation" (42:38).⁷⁰ And in another verse it states "And consult them in the affairs" (3:159)⁷¹

It was also pointed out that although the Prophet had divine guidance, he educated and trained his Companions by the practical application of *shūrā* not only in government but also in daily life. Hence it was clear from the Qur'ān, the Sunnah and the practice of the Companions that *shūrā* was to be a very important pillar of the political thinking of the Ibāḍīs.

In their attempt to establish *shūrā* in a government where the ruler had been selected, the Ibāḍīs make it into an institution. The ruler is to consult people who are qualified as follows:

1. They have to be well-known Ibāḍī scholars.
2. They are to be experts on the subjects requiring consultation.
3. They are to be known as pious, fearful of Allāh, trustworthy and truthful.

The role of *shūrā* in Ibāḍī constitutional thought is extended beyond consultation between the ruler or Imam and those scholars qualified to give advice. Ibāḍīs have institutionalised a council of consultation (*majlis al-shūrā*).⁷² They maintained that this council should meet for the following reasons:

1. To choose a new Imam once the Ibāḍīs had succeeded in forming a new state after the secret period. This happened when the first Imamate was formed in Oman in 132 A.H. and al-Julandā b. Mas‘ud was chosen as the Imam. Another example of this was the election of Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq al-Kindī as the Imam in the Ḥaḍramawt in 128 A.H.
2. To choose a new Imam after the death of the previous Imam. However, the precise method of choosing the Imam by *shūrā* has changed from time to time, depending on the political and other circumstances.⁷³
3. If the *majlis al-shūrā* wanted to change the Imam for a valid reason,⁷⁴ such as committing one of the major sins and not repenting of it but rather continuing stubbornly in his *kufir* so that it became public knowledge. The council renounce the Imam, declare him be a *kāfir* and remove him from his position. In such a case they would be allowed to

fight him and even kill him if he refused to resign.⁷⁵ On the other hand, the Ibādīs would not allow fighting or changing a just ruler.⁷⁶

Ibādīs recommend that at the time of selecting the Imam, as large a number of Muslims as possible should be present. However, it is well known that the minimum number for a valid election is the presence of five scholars who should be qualified described above.⁷⁷ The opinion of the Ibādīs was based on the following evidence:

1. Abū Bakr was selected as Caliph by five Companions: ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, Mu’ādh b. Jabal; Sālim, servant of Abū Ḥudhayfah; Bashīr b. Sa’d; and Usayd b. Khuḍayr.⁷⁸
2. ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān was selected as Caliph by the consensus of five Companions: ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Awf; Ṭalḥah b. ‘Ubayd Allāh; al-Zubayr b. al-‘Awwām; ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib; and Sa’d b. Abī Waqqāṣ.⁷⁹

However, there is another view, put forward by some Ibādīs who maintain that the selection may be made by two Muslim scholars who are freemen, pious and highly knowledgeable. Others even argue that selection may be made by one person. They point out that actually ‘Uthmān was chosen only by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Awf and that the rest of the Companions agreed with him. The people of Oman did this when Muḥammad b. Maḥbūb selected al-Ṣalt b. Mālik.⁸⁰

Some individual cases

As already noted the Ibādīs base their concept of *shūrā* for the selection of the Imam on the method used to select the first four Caliphs. They argue that it was the group of five Companions who selected Abū Bakr and the rest of the Muslims had acknowledged this selection by giving their pledge of allegiance to him. In the case of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, Abū Bakr nominated him on his deathbed after consultation with important Companions. The council of consultation is more clearly seen in the group of six nominated by ‘Umar to choose his successor. In the case of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, the process was less clear. The argument seems to be that it was unnecessary because ‘Alī was elected by popular acclamation by those present in Medina.

It seems that in selecting the Imam, Ibādīs view the council of consultation or *shūrā* as the ideal and necessary form on most occasions. However, it has been possible for the Imam to be selected in some cases without the formation of a council for consultation.

The procedure for appointing the Imam

When Ibādīs have selected an Imam and he has accepted the conditions which have been put to him by the members of the council of consultation,⁸¹ the most knowledgeable among them proceeds towards the chosen Imam and shakes his hand. He says: “I pledge allegiance to you to obey Allāh and His Prophet and to enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong.”⁸² The remaining members of the council

do the same. It is preferable for large numbers of people to participate in pledging allegiance to the Imam. After this the Imam puts his turban on his head and the seal on his finger.⁸³ Then the flag of the Imamate is raised beside him.

After the members of the *shūrā* pledge allegiance to the Imam, they select a speaker. The speaker praises Allāh and His Prophet, and then he makes a public speech, announcing that the Imam has been selected and giving his name. He then requests the people to pledge allegiance to the Imam,⁸⁴ and they come forward to do so.

Following this, one of the people gathered is told to pronounce “Allāh is Great” (*Allāh Akbar*).⁸⁵ The Imam then walks to the mosque surrounded on the way by a group of people carrying swords on their shoulders and continuing to say *Allāh Akbar*. After the prayer, they call out praise to Allāh, and then proclaim that there is no deity other than Allāh, repeating “Allāh is Great” and only Allāh Akbar is repeated three times.⁸⁶ Then they say:

No judgment is due except that of Allāh and no obedience is due to those who do not obey Allāh. No judgment is due except that of Allāh and no obedience is due to those who do not judge according to what Allāh has revealed. No judgment is due except that of Allāh. There are love and association with Allāh’s *awliyā’*. No judgment is due except that of Allāh. There are denouncement and separation from the enemy of Allāh. No judgment is due except that of Allāh.⁸⁷

When the contract is confirmed, the Imam gains the association (*walāyah*) of and authority over the Ibādīs. They must obey him and follow his orders as long as he fulfils the conditions of that contract according to his ability. However, if he fails to

meet any of them then he is renounced. This meant that the people are protected by the contract.⁸⁸ The Ibāḍī Imam enjoys absolute power within the limits of the *sharī‘ah*. Every Ibāḍī has to obey him and give him support and help.⁸⁹

The form of the pledge of allegiance (*bay‘ah*)

The pledge of allegiance appears in Ibāḍī sources in different forms but it contains the same meaning, that is, the requirement for the Imam to follow the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, to enjoin good and forbid wrong. One form of this is:

We have appointed you as an Imam to lead the Muslims, to judge in accordance with the Book of Allāh and the Sunnah of the Prophet and to enjoin good and forbid wrong as long as you are able to do so.”⁹⁰

Some scholars add: “and to promote the religion (*dīn*) of Allāh, which Allāh has asked His servant to follow and make victorious.”⁹¹ Other conditions that are mentioned are:

to commit yourself to the duty, prescribed by Allāh. It is an obligatory duty and it is a covenant binding upon you. You cannot renounce it: you have to fulfil it and keep it without limits. You have given your homage to Allāh. You have accepted it with your heartfelt intention of fulfilling it in obedience to Allāh. Allāh is a witness of this, and so are His angels and the Muslims who have attended this pledge of allegiance.”⁹²

Thus, the terms of the pledge of allegiance may differ from time to time according to the circumstances of the Ibāḍīs and the selected Imam. The least that can be accepted is “to pledge allegiance to obey Allāh and his Prophet and to enjoin good and forbid wrong.”⁹³

However, much fuller terms were later set out in the pledge of allegiance:

We pledge allegiance for the sake of Allāh: we intend with our sincerity and loyalty and that of the Muslims to obey Allāh and His Prophet; and to be *ashārī* for the sake of Allāh; to enjoin good and to forbid wrong; to maintain justice for relatives and non-relatives, the enemy and associates, the weak and the strong; to fulfil the covenant of Allāh; to judge according to the Book of Allāh justly and fairly for the worshipper of Allāh, to follow the Sunnah of the Prophet and in the footsteps of the guided Imams and the leaders of piety. You have sold yourself for the sake of Allāh to make *jihād* in his path; to fight the group of wicked tyrants (*baghī*) and any group who abstains from following the right path. You do this for the sake of Allāh to establish what is right. You will die without being helpless or accused of not fulfilling your duty. This is the way of these sincere people who sacrifice with a strong covenant. We have placed these conditions as a trust upon you. We pledge ourselves to you as our Imam for the Muslims. You have an authority over the worshippers of Allāh. Allāh orders the Imams to be just in their behaviours and, the speech and intentions. We intend and hope to help you if you are obedient to Allāh and trustworthy in private and in public. You should know that what you do should be done with kindness and fairness. You should always be calm in order to distinguish between what is just and what is unjust. You should place everybody where he places himself according to what he deserves in the judgement of the Muslims. You ought to show good manners and piety. You must avoid greed, you must carry out your work with firmness and implement all the judgments and teachings of Islam. You must intend to forgive and avoid being angry; be broad-minded and patient (*ḥalīm*) love what is right and its followers and dislike what is wrong and its followers. You must be humble for the sake of Allāh without weakness and avoid being proud; you must remove hatred and the state of ignorance. You must consult the people of knowledge, practise fully your religious duty and abstain from what Allāh has forbidden. Fear Allāh at all times; remember His presence, fear His punishment, and look forward to His forgiveness and His beauties. Repent before Allāh for all forms of sin and prepare for your death. Be ready for all forms of obedience day and night, in private and in public, to make what is right look pleasant and beautiful and to discourage wrong and make it look bad. Avoid hypocrisy. Be patient in carrying out what is right whether it pleases people or not, whether it makes them laugh or cry, whether it brings wealth or poverty, whether it leads to life or death.⁹⁴

After these conditions have been read to the selected person and he accepts them, he will be appointed as the Imam.

In general Ibāḍīs rule that all the conditions are to be in accordance with the *sharī'ah* and that the Imam is responsible for fulfilling them unless there are optional conditions. In that case it is left to the Imam to decide whether or not they needed to be implemented.⁹⁵

The appointment of an inadequate Imam

On some occasions there might be an Imam who is not sufficiently knowledgeable and strong, so Ibāḍīs limit his authority and his conduct in handling the affairs of the Imamate. The Imam has to consult the *shūrā* before taking any decision on the following matters:

1. The Imam is not allowed to receive any money or order anybody to receive it.
2. He is not to distribute that money or order anyone else to distribute it.
3. The Imam is not allowed to appoint any governors or order any governors to be appointed.
4. He is not allowed to pass judgment or order any form of judgment except after obtaining the agreement of the council of *shūrā*.⁹⁶

However, if the Imam is knowledgeable and strong, he has full authority and freedom of conduct within the terms already explained.⁹⁷

If the people of the *shūrā* want to appoint an Imam and they can find only one who is strong, brave and firm but lacks the knowledge of the *sharī'ah* and would not be capable of fulfilling the terms of *walāyah*, he is selected as the Imam. However they

also appoint a scholar who has the qualifications and authority of the *shūrā* to advise the Imam in his decisions.⁹⁸

The removal of the Imam

In general Ibāḍī scholars maintain that a just Imam cannot be removed.⁹⁹ However, they list three major factors that would enable his removal:

1. If he broke the conditions of his contract for the Imamate.
2. If a physical or mental change in the Imam rendered him incapable of carrying out his duties.
3. If under certain conditions, there was agreement by those who selected him, that is the *shūrā*, to remove him.

The Imam's break of contract by wrong-doing is divided into the following three categories:

1. General persistence in wrong-doing, even misdemeanours.
2. Committing grave sins which become publicly known.¹⁰⁰

Both of these categories refer to the Imams' persistence in wrong-doing even if it has been pointed out to him and he has been called upon to repent. If the Imam repents of his misbehaviour and reforms, he continues to be the Imam for it is unlawful to remove him after his repentance. However, if the Imam refuses to repent or persists in his misbehaviour despite saying that he has repented, then it is essential to remove him, and it is lawful to fight and kill him.

3. If Imam has committed a sin that incurs the revealed punishments (*ḥudūd*).

There is a consensus among Ibāḍī scholars that in such a case his Imamate would cease. Another man would be appointed to administer the *ḥadd* punishment. If the former Imam were guilty of adultery, clearly he would be stoned to death. If he were guilty of murder, he might lose his life if this were demanded by the next of kin. However, if only blood-money was demanded, he would not die. Similarly, if he were guilty of slander about adultery (*qadhf*) or fornication, if he were not married he could not be put to death. If he were guilty of theft, he would remain alive but would lose his hand. It is maintained that if, after receiving the *ḥadd* punishment, the Imam repents of his crime, he might continue as an associate (*walī*) with the other Ibāḍīs but he would never again become an Imam.

The second reason for the removal of the Imam is any change in his physical or mental state which would render him incapable of carrying out his duties, for example, If he became blind, insane or physically incompetent. However, he would still remain an associate (*walī*) of the Ibāḍīs.

The third major factor was that the *shūrā* could remove the Imam if they found someone better qualified. This seems to be more theoretical than practical. The Ibāḍīs constantly warn against causing disruption and dissension in the community. Therefore it is unlikely that the *shūrā* would do this unless it was sure of its power or had the agreement of the existing Imam.

Ibāḍī scholars also discuss the Imam's position if he begins to follow the teachings of another sect or if he appointed officials belonging to another sect who were unjust or unqualified for the post. Ibāḍī scholars first seek his repentance. If he refuses to abandon these teachings, Ibāḍīs would renounce him and fight him until he resigned or was killed. Where the Imam is surrounded by accusations of wrong-doing which could not be substantiated although there was strong suspicion against him, the scholars could confront him with these accusations and demand that he be removed. This is because the Imam could not be held under a dark cloud of suspicion when he was supposed to be the protector of Allāh's religion and the community. Although an Imam in such a situation would be dismissed, he would not be renounced nor would the community dissociate itself from him, for he would remain an associate (*walī*).¹⁰¹

The resignation of the Imam

In general Ibāḍīs maintain that the Imam is not allowed to resign unless he has committed a sin (*ḥadath*) and the people are not allowed to remove their Imam if he has not committed a sin (*ḥadath*).¹⁰² If the Imam wished to resign and there was a consensus in the *shūrā* that he should continue, then he had to continue.¹⁰³ However, if they agree to his demands, he can resign,¹⁰⁴ especially if that would be advantageous to the community.

However, some scholars refused to allow the resignation of the Imam owing to the example of Abū Bakr. He requested the Muslims to excuse him from his post of Caliph but 'Umar said: "You will not resign nor be excused."¹⁰⁵ These scholars

maintained that if any Imam resigned he ought to be asked to repent. If he repented, he resumed the activities of the Imam. The terms of repentance were as follows:

I seek Allāh's forgiveness, I repent before Allāh of my resignation of the Imamate, which was made compulsory for me by Allāh. After offering my resignation, I am withdrawing it. I am bound by my agreement. I shall be sincere and work hard for the Imamate to the best of my ability. Be witnesses to me in all my conduct.¹⁰⁶

The possibility of two Imams

The basic principle of Islam is that Muslims must be united. Therefore they should be ruled by one Imam because his presence is related to the protection of the religion, the application of its teachings in Muslim society and its promotion to others.¹⁰⁷

Ibādīs refuse to accept the existence of two Imams in one country at the same time¹⁰⁸ for the following reasons:

1. The Prophet was the only Imam. Also, during the time of the first two caliphs, there was only one Imam.¹⁰⁹
2. They claimed that 'Umar at Saqīfah, before pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr, said: "Allāh is one and Islam is one, and it is illegal to have two Imams at the same time for two swords cannot be put in one sheath (*ghamd*)."¹¹⁰
3. They reported a *ḥadīth* from the Prophet: "If you have two *amīrs*, kill one of them to prevent a dispute among the Muslims."¹¹¹ This *ḥadīth* applied if there were two Imams fighting, one of whom was just and

rightly guided, and the other unjust and misguided. Here the Ibāḍīs were to kill the unjust Imam¹¹² for he deserved such punishment.

In general, Ibāḍīs insist on having only one Imamate to prevent dispute and fighting. However, they allowed the existence of two Imamates if there is a logical and legal reason for it, for example, if Ibāḍīs are in two different countries and it is impossible to establish one Imamate.¹¹³ If there are two Ibāḍī Imams in two different countries, Ibāḍīs are to associate themselves with each Imam without questioning who had selected him, whether that Imam be in Oman or the Ḥaḍramawt.

Ibāḍīs in one country are not asked to obey and follow the Ibāḍī Imam in the other country, although they are to associate themselves with every Ibāḍī Imam. However, if the situation changed so that the two Imamates can be united then the separate Imamates both cease and the selection of an Imam would be left to the members of the *shūrā*.¹¹⁴ It seems that the existence of the two Imams in different countries is based on their recognition by the *shūrā*. However, where two Imams emerge in different countries, preference is given to the one who was established in a country where Imams are usually selected. If this applied to both countries, then preference would be given to the one who was the more knowledgeable, pious and brave. If they are both equal, then the Imamate would go to the one who was selected first. If this is not known, then the matter should be returned to the *shūrā*.¹¹⁵ This is somewhat obscure and may arise out of the fact that two Imams had existed at the same time in

Oman and North Africa. It seems to be an argument on the part of Oman to give precedence to its *shūrā*.

The Ibāḍī Imam cannot take the title of Commander of the Faithful (*amīr al-mu'minīn*) unless he rules the whole Muslim world as did Abū Bakr and 'Umar.¹¹⁶

This would mean that the Ibāḍī movement would have to be acceptable to the majority of other Muslims.¹¹⁷

The Imam and the traitor (*baghī*)

The Ibāḍī definition of the *baghī* is “the one who breaks his oath of allegiance to the just Imam after he has made the pledge.”¹¹⁸ This means that whoever pledges allegiance to the just Imam cannot break that oath because if he does, then he will be considered a *baghī*. If he persists, then Ibāḍīs will fight him until he submits fully and obeys the Imam.

Fighting the traitor is a duty (*wājib*) for every male who has reached the age of puberty. Ibāḍī treatment of the *baghī* is based upon the historical attitude to the arbitration agreed to by 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, and also on their interpretation of the verse of the Qur'ān “then fight you all against the one who causes outrage until he complies with the command of Allāh” (26:9).

The Ibāḍī understanding of this is that after the pledge of allegiance has been made, then the Imam must be obeyed. Anyone refusing to do so is challenged and requested

to obey the Imam. If he refuses, then the members of the Ibāḍī community can fight him until he submits or dies.¹¹⁹

Ibāḍīs limit the killing to the *baghī* only. They adopt the judgement of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib at the Battle of the Camel, where he said:

Do not pursue those who run. Do not kill the wounded. Do not take any wealth from them. Whoever throws away his weapon, is safe. Whoever closes his door is safe. They have gold and silver in their camp, it must not be taken. All that is taken are the instruments that they have used in the war and the animals that they have used on the battlefields.¹²⁰

‘Alī also said: “Take whatever they have used against you because it is not lawful to take the wealth of a dead Muslim.”¹²¹

Ibāḍīs also considered that the tyrant and his followers, in fact whoever opposes Ibāḍīs, whoever break the *ḥadd* set by Allāh or judge according to any law other than that of Allāh are misguided, hypocrites, unbelievers and *fāsiqun*. Ibāḍīs will invite them to stop what they are doing and if they refuse, then they are considered *bughāt*. As a result, their lives are forfeit and they are to be fought until they comply with the laws of Allāh or are killed.

Anyone who takes over the Imamate by force without being selected by the council of *shūrā* is a *baghī*.¹²² Ibāḍīs can call upon that Imam to return the Imamate and let the people select their Imam. If he refuses, Ibāḍīs can fight him until he submits or dies.

If a group of Ibādīs claims that the present Imam is *kāfir* and rebels against him, then they are *baghī* and should be fought until they comply and obey the Imam or they can prove their accusation against the Imam with other witnesses. If they fail, they remain *baghī* who deserve to be fought until they obey the Imam.

Ibādīs renounce all tyrants and whoever obeys them, believes them to be right or associates himself with them.¹²³ Muḥammad b. Maḥbub¹²⁴ said:

Whoever has supported the unjust and made them strong has helped wrong-doing. Whoever has done this by choice has helped the unjust. He does not deserve to be appointed as an Imam. Whoever orders anyone to help the people of oppression (*jawr*) and whoever helps or supports evil by orders or actions, then he becomes part of it. He must repent or he will be renounced by the Ibādīs.¹²⁵

It seems that the word *baghī* has a wide meaning in the Ibādī community. It is used for any sinful behaviour or the support of those who disagree with the Ibādī interpretation of certain matters.

The Imams and *taqiyyah*

As already mentioned, the Imam of sacrifice (*shirāʾ*) is not allowed to use *taqiyyah* to protect himself because he has sold himself to Allāh and he has to fulfil his covenant to Allāh until only three men are left. Then he is allowed to return to the state of *kitmān* and use *taqiyyah*.¹²⁶ However, if the Imam of defence and his followers are defeated, they are allowed to return to the state of *kitmān* and use *taqiyyah*. The situation is more problematic for the full Imam or the Imam of manifestation if there is rebellion against him or if he is attacked by the forces of

oppression (*baghī*). If the rebels number more than twice that of the army of the Imam and if they have attacked his territory, he must confront them because it is his duty to defend the Muslims. Other opinions have stated that the Imam is like other people and that he can therefore use *taqiyyah* depending on his situation. If his opponents number more than twice that of his army or supporters, he can fight them. Although it is a preferred task for him to do, it is not a duty. However, if the number of the opponents is the same as that of the Imam's army or smaller, then resistance is a duty for him.¹²⁷ In general, it appears from the previous opinion that Ibādī scholars do not approve of the use of *taqiyyah* by an Imam, especially if he was already on the battlefield or if he is a *shārī* Imam who has sold his life to Allāh according to the verses from the Qur'ān: "Verily, Allāh had purchased of the believers their lives and their properties, for the price that theirs should be the Paradise."¹²⁸ However, *taqiyyah* can be used if a tyrant takes over the land that used to be under the control of the Ibādīs and they lack the power to turn them back, or if there is a dispute among Ibādī scholars. For example if they fear that the tyrant will kill women and children, they can use *taqiyyah*, accept the tyrant's rule with their tongue and nothing else should be done.¹²⁹

Conclusion

It should be noted that the conditions of the Imam are very similar to those laid down in Sunnī works of political thought. The requirement that the Imam must be a Qurayshī is carefully explained away so that it is not longer relevant. The duties of the Imam are also similar to those mentioned by Sunnī writers. However, there is a

much more detailed picture of these duties with the threat that failure to observe them may result in dismissal. The duty of social responsibility also emphasises the close relationship which must exist between the Imam and the community. Although listed under the rights of the Imam, his right to be advised also includes the necessity of him listening to that advice or being removed from office. This is further developed in the role of the *shūrā* in giving advice to the Imam. Thus, the *shūrā* plays an important role, not only in appointing the Imam but also in advising him if he fails in the requirements which have been set for him. The detailed demands in some of the pledges of allegiance indicate that the Imam is very much limited and controlled by the *shūrā*.

In the ceremony after the pledge of allegiance, there is much repetition of the early Khārijite slogan at Siffin: "The only judgment is that of Allāh." This emphasises the continuity between the Ibādīs and those early Khārijites. It also emphasises the importance of the Qur'ān to the Ibādīs.

Another feature Ibādīs' discussion of the Imamate is the use of traditions from the Prophet. As mentioned earlier, in their attack on 'Uthmān and 'Alī, Ibādīs relied principally on quotations from the Qur'ān. Although there is frequent reference to the violation of the Sunnah of the Prophet and that of Abū Bakr and 'Umar, they are not given in the form of *aḥādīth*.

However, as far as the institution of the Imamate is concerned, there is a much fuller use

of *aḥādīth*. This would seem to indicate that the elaboration of the Ibādīs' theory of the Imamate took place after al-Rabī' b. Habib had consolidated the status of *aḥādīth* in his *Musnad*.

¹ Abū Bakr al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannaḥ*, vol. X, 1.

² Abū al-Hasan, *Sirat Abū al-Hasan*, vol. II, 175.

³ Abū al-Hasan, 175; Al-Kindī, vol. X, 3.

⁴ *Idem*.

⁵ Abū Bakr al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannaḥ*, vol. X, 4.

- ⁶ Khamīs b. Sa‘īd al-Shaqṣī, *Minhāj al-Ṭālibīn wa Balāgh al-Raghibīn*, vol. VIII, 42.
- ⁷ Ibid ; Al-Kindī, vol. X, 5. This *hadith* is also narrated by Muslim on the authority of ‘Awf b. Mālik.
- ⁸ Ibn Ibāḍ, *Sirat Ibn Ibāḍ, al-Siyar wa al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 344.
- ⁹ *Idem.*
- ¹⁰ Qur’ān 17:38
- ¹¹ Al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII, 40.
- ¹² *Idem.*
- ¹³ Al-Kindī, vol. X, 23.
- ¹⁴ Abū al-Ḥasan, *Sirat Abū al-Ḥasan al-Siyar wa al-Jawabāt*, vol II, 175.
- ¹⁵ *Idem.*
- ¹⁶ *Idem.*
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 176.
- ¹⁸ *Idem.*
- ¹⁹ Al-Rabī‘, *al-Musnad*, 122.
- ²⁰ al-Kindī, *Muṣannaf*, vol. X, 23.
- ²¹ Al-Rabī‘, *al-Musnad*, 18.
- ²² Al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII, 41.
- ²³ This is related to the meeting between *Muhajirīn* and *Ansār* at Ṣaqīfah.
- ²⁴ al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. X, 24; Abū al-Ḥasan, vol. II, 175.
- ²⁵ al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII, 42.
- ²⁶ His name was Mūsā b. ‘Alī.
- ²⁷ al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII, 43.
- ²⁸ Abū al-Ḥasan, *Sirat Abū al-Ḥasan*, vol. II, 176.
- ²⁹ Aṭṭaysh, *Sharḥ al-Nīal*, vol. XIV/1, 271; Al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol X, 27.
- ³⁰ *Idem.*
- ³¹ *Idem.*
- ³² Al-Kindī, vol. X, 77.
- ³³ *Idem.*
- ³⁴ *Idem.*
- ³⁵ *Idem.*
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, 65.
- ³⁷ Al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII, 48.
- ³⁸ Al-Rabī‘, *Musnad*, 18, on the authority of Ibn ‘Abbās.
- ³⁹ *Idem.*
- ⁴⁰ *Idem.*
- ⁴¹ *Idem.*

-
- ⁴² Nūr al-Dīn al-Sālimī, *Sharḥ al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, vol. I, 77.
- ⁴³ Al- 'Abrī, 127.
- ⁴⁴ Ibn 'Aṭīyyah, Shibīb, *Sirat Ibn 'Aṭīyyah*, vol II, 385.
- ⁴⁵ Al-Kindī, vol. X, 156.
- ⁴⁶ Al-Shāṭibī, vol. I, .81; al-Zuhīlī, vol.VI, 700.
- ⁴⁷ Al-Kindī, vol. X, 156.
- ⁴⁸ *Idem.*
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 166.
- ⁵⁰ *Idem.*
- ⁵¹ *Idem.*
- ⁵² Al-Kindī, 165.
- ⁵³ *Idem.*
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.* , 164.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.* , 163.
- ⁵⁶ *Idem.*
- ⁵⁷ Jaḥlān, 204.
- ⁵⁸ Abū al-Ḥasan, vol. II, 178.
- ⁵⁹ Al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. X, 126.
- ⁶⁰ *Idem.*
- ⁶¹ Al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII. 54..
- ⁶² Al-Kindī, vol. VIII, 127.
- ⁶³ Khalil, op. cit., 212.
- ⁶⁴ Narrated by Al-Rabī', on the authority of 'Ubādah b. al-Samit, 121.
- ⁶⁵ Al-Sālimī, *Sharḥ al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, vol. II, 284.
- ⁶⁶ Al-Shaqṣī, 54.
- ⁶⁷ Al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannif*, vol. X, 131.
- ⁶⁸ Abū al-Ḥasan, 224.
- ⁶⁹ *Idem.*
- ⁷⁰ Ibn Sallām, 77.
- ⁷¹ *Idem.*
- ⁷² Jaḥlān. 188.
- ⁷³ *Idem.*
- ⁷⁴ M. Aṭṭaysh, *Sharḥ al-Nīāl*, vol. XIV/1, 335.
- ⁷⁵ Ibādīs cite the example of 'Uthmān. He was asked to resign but refused, so they killed him. Al-Kindī, *al-Ihtidā'*, 84-5.
- ⁷⁶ This is the opinion of the majority of Ibādī scholars.
- ⁷⁷ Al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. X, 100; Jaḥlān, 188.

-
- ⁷⁸ Al-Kindī, 100.
- ⁷⁹ *Idem.*
- ⁸⁰ *Idem.*
- ⁸¹ Al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII, 48.
- ⁸² Al-Kindī, vol. X, 93; Al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII, 48.
- ⁸³ *Idem.*
- ⁸⁴ *Idem.*
- ⁸⁵ *Idem.*
- ⁸⁶ M. Aṭṭayash, vol. XIV/1, 317.
- ⁸⁷ Al-Kindī, vol. X, 93.
- ⁸⁸ Jaḥlān, 191.
- ⁸⁹ *Idem.*
- ⁹⁰ Al-Kindī, vol. X, 89.
- ⁹¹ *Idem.*
- ⁹² *Idem.*
- ⁹³ *Idem.*
- ⁹⁴ Al-Kindī, vol. X, 91 - 2 ; Aṭṭayash, vol. XIV/1, 316-7.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid*
- ⁹⁶ Al-Kindī, vol. X, 71; Al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII, 45.
- ⁹⁷ Ḥusayn Ghabash, *ʿUmān al-Dimuqrāṭiyyah*, 1996, 71.
- ⁹⁸ Al-Kindī, vol. X, 70.
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid*, 215.
- ¹⁰⁰ Al-Shaqṣī, 76.
- ¹⁰¹ Al-Kindī, 215.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid*, 229.
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid*, 226.
- ¹⁰⁴ Al-Shaqṣī, 81.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Idem.*
- ¹⁰⁶ Al-Kindī, vol. X, 232; al-Shaqṣī, vol. VIII, 83; Al-Kindī, *Kitāb al-Ihtidāʾ*, ed. S.I. Kashif, Oman, 1985, 77.
- ¹⁰⁷ Khalid Madkur, 380.
- ¹⁰⁸ Ibn Maḥbūb, *Sirat Ibn Maḥbūb, al-Siyar wa al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 267; Al-Kindī, al-Musannaf, vol. X, 116; Aṭṭayash, *Sharḥ al-Nīāl*, vol. XIV/1, 370.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Idem.*
- ¹¹⁰ Ibn Maḥbūb, *Sirat Ibn Maḥbūb, al-Siyar wa al-Jawabāt*, vol. II, 267; Al-Kindī, al-Musannaf, vol. X, 116; Aṭṭayash, *Sharḥ al-Nīāl*, vol. XIV/1, 370.
- ¹¹¹ Ibn Maḥbūb, vol. II, 266.

-
- ¹¹² *Idem.*
- ¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 267.
- ¹¹⁴ Al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannaḡ*, vol. X, 119.
- ¹¹⁵ *Idem.*
- ¹¹⁶ Al-Kindī, *al-Muṣannaḡ*, 123.
- ¹¹⁷ Aṭṭayash, vol. XIV/1,372.
- ¹¹⁸ Al-Ruqīshī, 30.
- ¹¹⁹ Abū al-Mu'thir, *Sirat Abū al-Mu'thir*, 297.
- ¹²⁰ Haroon Ibn al-Yamān, *Risalat Ibn al-Yamān ila Jayfar*, vol. I, 352; Abū al-Ḥasan, vol. II, 126.
- ¹²¹ *Idem.*
- ¹²² *Idem.*
- ¹²³ Abū al-Ḥasan, vol. II, 86.
- ¹²⁴ Muhammad Muḥbub was an Ibādī scholars in the third century. He was employed as a judge and died in Ṣuḥār in 260 A.H.
- ¹²⁵ Ibn Maḥbūb, vol. II, 244.
- ¹²⁶ Khamīs al-Shaqāṣī, *Minhāj al-Ṭālibīn*, vol. VIII, 74.
- ¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 73.
- ¹²⁸ *Idem.*
- ¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 75.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources:

- Abū 'Ubaydah, *Sirat Abū 'Ubaydah ila- 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Rustamī*, Oman, 1986.
- Abū al-Ḥawarī, Muḥammad, *Sīrat Abū al-Ḥawarī*, Muscat, 1986.
- Abū al-Mu'athir, al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *Al-Aḥdāth*, Muscat, 1986.
- Abū al-Mu'athir, al-Ṣalt b. Khamīs, *Fi Qitāl ahl al-Baghī*, Muscat, 1986.
- Abū Bakr b. al-'Arabī, *Al-'Awāṣim min al-qwāsim fī taḥqiq mwaqif al-ṣaḥāba ba'd waqt al-nabi*, ed. Muḥib al-Dīn, Cairo, 1968.
- Abū Gaḥṭān, Khalid b. Qaḥṭān, *Sirat Ibn Qaḥṭān*, Muscat, 1986.
- Abū Yaḥyā, Yaḥyā b. Sa'id, *Al-Iḍāḥ fī al-Aḥkām*, Egypt, 1984.
- Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj*, Beirut, 1979.
- Abū Zakariyya, Yaḥyā b. Abū Bakr, *Kitāb al-siyar wa akhbār al-'immah*, ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ayūb, Tunis, 1985.
- Al-Ājūrī, Abū Bakr, *Kitāb al-Sharī'ah*, ed. 'Abd Allāh al-Damayjī, Riyadh, 1997.
- Aṣfahānī, Abū al-Faraj, *al-Aghānī*, Beirut, 1995.
- Al-Shahrastānī, Abū al-Faṭḥ, *Al-Milal wa-al-Niḥal*, 2 vols. Beirut, 1996.
- Al-'Asqalānī, Aḥmed b. 'Alī b. Ḥajar, *Al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah*, Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 4 vols., Beirut, n.d.
- Al-'Asqalānī, Aḥmed b. 'Alī b. Ḥajar, *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, 13 vols., Beirut, 1379 A.H.
- Al-'Asqalānī, Aḥmed b. 'Alī b. Ḥajar, *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*, ed. 'Abd al-Waḥḥāb 'Abd al-Laṭīf, 2 vols., Beirut, 1395 A.H.
- Al-'Asqalānī, Aḥmed b. 'Alī b. Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, 12vols., India, 1325-27A.H.
- Aṭfiysh, Muḥammad Yusuf, *Sharḥ al-Nīal*, 29vols., Muscat, 1986.
- Al-'Awtabī, Salamah b. Maslamah, *Kitāb al-Ansāb*, vol. I, Muscat, 1984.
- Al-'Awtabī, Salamah b. Maslamah, *Kitāb al-Ansāb*, vol. II, Oman, 1990.

- Al-Azkawī, Abū Jābir Muḥammad, *al-Jāmi'*, ed. 'Abd Almun'im 'Amir, Oman, n.d.
- Al-Azkawī, Sirḥān Sa'id *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ*, ed. 'Abd al-Majīd Ḥasīb al-Qaysī, Oman, n.d.
- Al-Barādī, Abū al-Faḍal, *al-Jawāhir al-Muntaqāh*, Bārūnī Press, 1893.
- Al-Balādhurī, Ahmed, *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, Cairo, 1956.
- Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, vol., IV/1, ed. Iḥsān 'Abbās, Beirut, 1979.
- Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. III, ed. 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dūrī, Weisbaden, 1979.
- Al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismā'il, *al-Ta'rīkh al-Kabīr*, India, 1380 A.H.
- Al-Būsa'idī, Muhanna, b. Khalfān, *Kitāb Lubāb al-Athār al-Wāridah 'ala al-Awwalīn wa-al-Mut'akhirīn al-Akhyār*, 14 vols., Oman, 1984-1987.
- Al-Darjīnī, Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad, *Ṭabaqāt al-Mashaykh fī al-Maghrib*, ed. Ibrahim Ṭallaī, al-Blidah, 1974.
- Al-Dīnāwarī, Abū Ḥanīfah, Aḥmad b. Dawood, *Al-Akhbar al-Ṭiwāl*, ed. 'Abd al-mun'im 'Amir, Cairo, 1960.
- Al-Ḥamawī, Yāqūt, *Mujam al-Buldān*, Beirut, n. d.
- Ibn al-Athīr, Abū al-Ḥasan Izz al-Dīn, *Al-Kāmil fī al-Ta'rīkh*, Beirut, 1989.
- Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī, Abū Muḥammad 'Alī, *Al-Faṣl fī al-Milal Wal-Ahwā wa al-Niḥal*, 3 vols., Beirut, 1996.
- Ibn al-Ruḥayl, Maḥbūb, *Sirat Maḥbūb b. al-Ruḥayl ila ahl 'Umān fī amr Haroon b. al-Yamān*, Muscat, 1987.
- Ibn al-Ruḥayl, Maḥbūb, *Sirat Maḥbūb b. al-Ruḥayl ila ahl Ḥaḍramawt fī amr Haroon b. al-Yamān*, Muscat, 1987.
- Ibn al-Saghir al-Mālikī, *Akhbār al-A'immaḥ al-Rutumiyyīn*, ed. Muḥammad Naṣir and Ibrahim Biḥāz, Beirut, 1986.
- Ibn Barakah, Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh, *Kitāb al-Muazanah*, n.p., 1986.
- Ibn Ibād 'Abd Allāh, *Sirat Ibn Ibād, al-Siyar wa al-Jawābāt*, vol. II, Oman, 1986.
- Ibn Maḥbūb, Muḥammad, *Sirat Muḥammad b. Maḥbūb*, Oman, 1986.
- Ibn Ruzīq, Salil, *History of Imams and Siyyids of Oman*, trans., Badger, G.P. London, 1871.

- Ibn Shabbah, Abū Zayd, 'Umar, *Kitab ta'rīkh al-Madinah al-Munwwarah*, ed. Fahim Muhammad Shaltūt, Riyad, 1979.
- Ibn Sallām, Abū 'Ubayd al-Qāsim, *Kitāb al-Amwāl*, Beirut, 1975.
- Ibn Sallām al-Ibādī, *al-Islam min Wajhat Naẓār al-Ibādīyyah*, ed. Sālim b. Ya'qūb, Wiesbaden, 1986.
- Al-Ja'lānī, Munīr b. Niyyar, *Sirah ila al-Imam Ghasan*, Muscat, 1989.
- Jamīl b. Khamīs, *Qāmūs al-Sharīah*, 19 vols., Oman, 1983.
- Janāwnī, Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥayā, *Kitāb al-Waḍ'*, Oman, n.d.
- Al-Jīṭālī, Abū Ṭahīr Isma'īl b. Mūsā, *Qanāṭir al-Khayrat*, 3 vols., Oman, 1989.
- Al-Jīṭālī, Abū Ṭahīr Isma'īl b. Mūsā, *Qawā'id al-Islām*, 2 vols., Oman, 1992.
- Khalīfah b. Khayāt, *Ta'rīkh Khalīfah*, ed. Akram Diyā' al-'Umarī, Beirut, 1977.
- Al-Kindī Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh, *Kitāb al-Muṣannaḥ*, vol. VIII, Oman, 1985.
- Al-Kindī, Abū Bakr Aḥmed bin 'Abd Allāh, *Kitāb al-Ihtidā'*, ed. S.I. Kashif, Oman, 1985.
- Al-Kindī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh *al-Jawhar al-Muqtaṣar*, Oman, 1985.
- Al-Kindī, Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, *Bayan al-Shar'*, 52 vols, Oman, 1988.
- Al-Kudamī, Abū Sa'īd , Muḥammad b. Sa'īd, *al-Mu'tabar*, 4 vols. Oman, 1985.
- Al-Kudamī, Abū Sa'īd , Muḥammad b. Sa'īd, *al-Istiḳāmah*, 3 vols. Oman, 1985.
- Al-Kudamī, Muḥammad b Sa'īd, *al-Jāmi' al-muḥīd min aḥkām Abī Sa'īd*, Oman, 1985.
- Al-Malṭī, Abū al-Ḥasan, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, *Al-Tanbiyah wa al-Radd 'ala Ahl al-Ahwā wa al-Bid'a*, Eygpt, 1993.
- Al-Manqarī, Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, *Waq'at Ṣiffīn*, ed. Abd al-Salām Haroon, Cairo, 1383.A.H.
- Al-Marzawī, Abū 'Abd-Allāh b. Ḥammad, *Al-Fitan*, ed. Suhil Dhakkar, Beirut, 1993.
- Al-Mubarrad, Muḥammad b. Yazīd, *Al-Kāmil fi al-Adab*, ed. M. Ibrāhīm and S. Shaḥātah, Cairo, 1956.

- Al-Qalhātī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, Muḥammad Sa‘īd al-Azdī, *Al-Kashf wa-al-Bayān*, 2 vols., Oman, 1980.
- Al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb, *Musnad*, Oman, n.d.
- Rasā’il Jābir b. Zayd*, type-written compilation from manuscripts in the Library of the Ministry of National Heritage and Culture, Oman, n.d.
- Al-Ruqayshī, Muḥammad b. Salim b. Zāhir, *Al-Nūr al-Waqād fi ‘ilm al-Rashād*, Oman, 1984.
- Al-Sālimī, Nūr al-Dīn, *Tuḥfat al-A’yān fi Sīrat ahl ‘Umān*, vols., I & II, Oman, n.d.
- Al-Sālimī, Nūr al-Dīn *Sharḥ al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, 3 vols., Oman, n.d.
- Al-Shammākhī, Abū al-‘Abbās, *Mukhtaṣar al-‘Adl wa Inṣāf*, Oman, n.d.
- Al-Shammākhī, Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd, *Al-Ṣiyar*, 2 vols., I, ed. Aḥmad b. Sa‘ūd al-Siyābī, Oman, 1992.
- Al-Shaqṣī, Khamis b. Sa‘īd, *Minḥāj al-Ṭālibīn wa Balāgh al-Raghbīn*, Oman, 1993.
- Siyar wa-al-Jawābat li-‘Ulāma’ wa-A’immat ‘Umān*, ed. Sayyidah Ismā‘īl Kāshif, Oman, vol I, 1989 & II, 1986.
- Al-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh al-Rusul wa-al-Mulūk*, ed. de Goeje et al, Leiden, 1879-1901.
- Al-Ṭabarī, *The History of al-Ṭabarī*, XX, (trans.) Hawting, G. R., New York, 1989.
- Wa’il b. Ayūb, *Sīrat Wā’il b. Ayūb*, Oman, 1986.
- Al-Warjālānī, Abī Zakariyyā Yaḥyā b. Abū Bakr, *Al-Siyar wa-Akḥbār al-A’immah*, Oman, n.d.
- Al-Warjālānī, Abū Ya‘qub, Yusuf, *Al-Dalīl wa-al-Burhān*, Omān, 1983.

Secondary sources:

- Abū ‘īd, ‘Arif, *Waḍīfat al-Ḥākim fi al-Dawlah al-Islamiyyah*, Kuwait, 1985.
- Abū Faris, Muḥammed ‘Abd-Alqadir, *Ḥukm al-Shūrā fi al-Islam wa Nattātiha*, ‘Amman. 1988.
- Arnold, Thomas W., *The Caliphate*, Oxford, 1924.
- Aṭfiysh, Muḥammad Yusuf, *Shāmil al-Aṣl wa al-Far‘*, Muscat, 1984.
- Aṭfiysh, Muḥammad Yusuf, *Kashf al-Karb*, Muscat, 1985.

- Aṭfiysh, Muḥammad Yusuf, *Sharḥ 'Aqādat al-Tawḥīd*, Muscat, n.d.
- Aṭfiysh, Muḥammad Yusuf, *Wafā al-Ḍamān bi-Adā' al-Amānah fi fan al-Ḥadīth*, 5 vols., Muscat, 1986.
- Bajiyh, Ṣaliḥ, *Al-Ibāḍiyyah Biljarīd fi al-'Uṣur al-Islamiyyah*, Tunis, n.d.
- Al-Bārūnī, Sulayman, *Al-Azhār al-Riyāḍiyyah fi Aimmat wa Muluk al-Ibāḍiyyah*, Muscat, 1987.
- Bravmann, M. M., *The Spiritual Background of Early Islam*, Leiden, 1972.
- Al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Beirut, n.d.
- Cook, Michael, *Early Muslim Dogma*, Cambridge, 1980.
- Cook, Michael, *Muhammad*, Oxford, 1983.
- Cook, Michael and Crone, Patricia, *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World*, Cambridge, 1977.
- Dennet, Daniel C., *Conversion and the Poll Tax in Early Islam*, Cambridge, 1950.
- Donner, Fred, *The Early Islamic Conquest*, New Jersey, 1981.
- Al-Dariynī, Faṭḥī, *Khaṣā'iṣ al-Tashrī' al-Islamī*, Bierūt, 1987.
- Ennamī, A. k., *Studies in Ibāḍism*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 1971.
- Encyclopaedia of Islam, Leiden, 2nd
- Al-Fakhrī, 'Alī b. Muḥammad, *Talkhīṣ al-Bayān fi dhikr firaq ahl al Adiyān*, London, 1994.
- Ghabash, Ḥusayn, *Oman al-dimūqrāṭiyyah al-Islamiyyah*, Dar al-Jadīd, 1997.
- Guillaume, Alfred, *The Traditions of Islam*, Oxford, 1924.
- Ḥabīb, Mal-Allāh, *Malāmiḥ min Ta'rīḥ 'Uman*, Cairo, n.d.
- Al-Ḥārithī, Mālīk b. Sulṭān, *Naḍariyah al-Imamah 'ind al-Ibāḍiyyah*, Muscat, 1991.
- Al-Ḥārithī, Salīm b. Ḥumūd, *al-'Uḡud al-Fiḍḍiyyah fi Uṣūl al-Ibāḍiyyah*, Muscat, 1983.
- Hāshim, Maḥdī Ṭālib, *al-Ḥarakah al-Ibāḍiyyah fi al-Mashriq al-'Arabī*, Baghdad, 1981.
- Al-Hāshimī, S.M, *Imām Sālīm b. Rāshid*, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Leeds, December, 1994.

- Ibn Ruzayq, Ḥumayd b. Muḥammad, *Al-Shu'ā' al-Shā'i' billm'ān fi Dhikr A'imat 'Umān*, ed. Abd al-Mu'min 'Amir, Oman, 1978.
- Jahlan, 'Idūn, *Al-Fikr al-Siyasī 'ind al-Ibāḍiyyah*, Muscat, 1991.
- Kremer, Alfred Von, *The Orient under the Caliphs*, trans. S. Khuda Bukksh, Philadelphia, 1977.
- Al-Khalilī, Ahmad, *Al-Ḥaqq al-Dāmigh*, Muscat, Oman, n.d
- Khulayfat, 'Awaḍ Muḥammad, *Nashat al-Ḥarakah al-Ibāḍiyyah*, Amman, 1978.
- Landen, R.G, *Oman since 1856. Disruptive Modernization in a Traditonal Arab Society*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1967.
- Levey, Reuben, *The social structure of Islam*, Cambridge, 1975.
- Lewis, Bernard, *Islam from the Prophet Muhammad to the Capture of Constantinople*, London, 1979.
- Madelung, W., *The Succession to Muḥammad*, Cambridge, 1997.
- Morris, Claud, *Oman*, Morris International, 1991.
- Mu'ammār, 'Alī.Yaḥyā, *Al-Ibāḍiyyah fi Mawḳib al-Ta'rīkh*, Omān, 1993.
- Mu'ammār, 'Alī.Yaḥyā, *Al-Ibāḍiyyah bayn al-Firaq al-Islamiyyah*, 1986.
- Mu'ammār, 'Alī.Yaḥyā, *Al-Ibāḍiyyah Madhab Islamī Mu'atadil*, Omān, n.d.
- Muir, William, *The Caliphate, its Rise, Decline, and Fall*, Oxford, 1892.
- Naṣīr, Muḥammad, *Dawr al-Ibāḍiyyah fi Nashr al-Islam bigharb Afriqiya*, Oman, n.d
- Philips, Wendel, *Oman; a History*, Longman, 1967.
- Qashār, Bilḥāj b. 'Addun, *al-Lum'ah al-Muḍiyyah fi Tarīkh al-Ibāḍiyyah*, Oman, 1990.
- Al-Qatbiyyah, Mariyam bint Sa'īd, *Naḍrat fi al-Madhab al-Ibāḍī*, Oman, n.d.
- Al-Qaḥṭānī, Muḥammed Sa'īd, *Alwālā wa al-Braā'*, 1409 A.H.
- Al-Qnnūbī, Sa'īd b. Mabruk. *Al-Imam al-Rabī 'a b. Ḥabīb*, Oman, 1995.
- Rosenthal, Erwin, *Political thought in Islam: An Introductory Outline*, Cambridge, 1958.
- Al-Ṣa'awī, Naṣīr 'Abd-Allāh, *al-Khawārij*, Riyaḍ, 1996.

- Salem, Elie Adib, *The Political Theory and Institutions of the Khawārij*, Baltimore, 1956.
- Al-Sālimī, Abū Bashīr, Muḥammed b. Ḥumaīd, *Nahḍat al-A'īan Biḥriyat 'Umān*, Cairo, n.d.
- Al-Ṣallābī, 'Alī Muḥammed, 'Aṣr al-Dawlatayn al-Umawiyyah wa al-'Abbasiyyah wa ṣahūr al-Khawārij, 1998.
- Al-Ṣawwafī, Ṣaliḥ b. Aḥmad, *al-Imām Jābir b. Zayd wa Ātharih fi al-Da'wah*, Oman, 1989.
- Al-Shaṭībī, Ibrahīm b Mūsa, *Al-Mūwafqat fi uṣūl al-Shrī'ah*, Beirut, 1991.
- Al-Siyābī, Salim b. Ḥumud, *Aṣḍaq al-Manahij fi Tamyīz al-Ibāḍiyyah 'an al-Khawārij*, Omān, 1987.
- Al-Siyābī, Salim b. Ḥumud, *Omān 'Abr al-Tarīkh*, Oman, 1993.
- Ṣuhaīb Ḥasan, *An Itroduction to the Science of Ḥadīth*, Riyaḍ, 1996.
- Suhil, Naif 'Aīd Jabir, *Al-Ibāḍiyyah fi al-Khalīj al-'Arabī*, Kuwait, 1994.
- 'Umar ba,'Umar b. al-Ḥāj Muḥammad, *Dirasah fi al-Fikr al-Ibāḍī*, Oman, 1992.
- Versey-Fitzgerald, Seymour, *Muhammadan Law*, London, 1931.
- Watt, M., *Islamic Political Thought*, Edinburgh, 1968.
- Watt, M., *Muhammad Prophet and Statesman*, Oxford, 1961.
- Watt, W., *Islamic Creeds*, Edinburgh, 1994.
- Wellhausen, J., *The Religio-Political Faction in Early Islam*, (trans. R.C.Ostle and S.M.Walzer), Amsterdam, 1975.
- Williams, John, *The World of Islam*, London, 1994.
- Wilkinson J.C., *The Imamate of Oman*, Cambridge, 1987.
- Yass Ḥussain Aḥmad, *Al-Ibāḍiyyah fi al-Maghrib al-'Arabī*, Oman, 1992.
- Al-Zūḥilī, Wahbah, *Al-Fiqh al-Islamī wa adillatahu*, Damascus, 1989.